OVID *HEROIDES* 11, 13 AND 14

MNEMOSYNE

BIBLIOTHECA CLASSICA BATAVA

COLLEGERUNT

H. PINKSTER · H.W. PLEKET · C.J. RUIJGH

D.M. SCHENKEVELD · P.H. SCHRIJVERS

S.R. SLINGS

BIBLIOTHECAE FASCICULOS EDENDOS CURAVIT

C.J. RUIJGH, KLASSIEK SEMINARIUM, OUDE TURFMARKT 129, AMSTERDAM

SUPPLEMENTUM DUCENTESIMUM VICESIMUM PRIMUM

JAMES. REESON

OVID *HEROIDES* 11,13 AND 14

OVID *HEROIDES* 11,13 AND 14

A COMMENTARY

BY

JAMES REESON

BRILL
LEIDEN · BOSTON · KÖLN
2001

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

Die Deutsche Bibliothek - CIP-Einheitsaufnahme

[Mnemosyne / Supplementum]
Mnemosyne : bibliotheca classica Batava. Supplementum. – Leiden ; Boston ; Köln : Brill
Früher Schriftenreihe
Teilw. u.d.T.: Mnemosyne / Supplements
Reihe Supplementum zu: Mnemosyne
221. Reeson, James : Ovid *Heroides* 11, 13 and 14.

Reeson, James :
Ovid *Heroides* 11, 13 and 14 : a commentary / by James Reeson. – Leiden ; Boston ; Köln : Brill, 2001
(Mnemosyne : Supplementum ; 221)
ISBN 90–04–12140–4

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data is also available

ISSN 0169-8958
ISBN 90 04 12140 4

© Copyright 2001 by Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, The Netherlands

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by Brill provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910 Danvers MA 01923, USA. Fees are subject to change.

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

In memory of
F.E. Reeson

CONTENTS

Preface ix
List of abbreviations xi

Introduction
Wrongthinking heroines and inquisitive readers 1
The Text 8
Openings 10
Background to each epistle 12

Text
Conspectus codicum 15
Sigla 15
Comparative table 16

Commentaries
Commentary on *Heroides* 11, Canace to Macareus 37
Commentary on *Heroides* 13, Laodamia to Protesilaus 114
Commentary on *Heroides* 14, Hypermestra to Lynceus 210

List of references 315

Indexes 323
1. Latin Words 325
2. General 330
3. Passages referred to in Ovid 338
4. Passages referred to in other authors 348

PREFACE

'The *Heroides* are not a work of the highest order of genius.' Despite a surge of recent interest in these poems, this judgement of Grant Showerman's has not yet been entirely laid to rest, and haunts the current Loeb edition. The present work sets out for three of Ovid's *Heroides* an interpretation that presents them as rich and sophisticated miniatures. It does this through the close and detailed reading of the text that the commentary format affords. For epistles 13 (Laodamia) and 14 (Hypermestra), no commentary in English has appeared since that by Arthur Palmer in 1898. Epistle 11 (Canace) was included in Peter Knox's 1995 commentary on 'Select Epistles'; but the scope and purpose of that work necessarily set narrow limits on what could be done. I set out in my Introduction my particular areas of enquiry: put simply, text and sources. An extremely mangled text (so confused that there is still no Oxford text of the poems) calls for considerable attention paid to textual matters. Ovid's highly innovative use of source material in the *Heroides* is only just now beginning to be explored: for epistle 11, I attempt to advance the work already done; and my account of advanced intertextual play in epistles 13 and 14 marks a new direction in the interpretation of these poems.

The commentary was presented for the doctoral degree at the University of Newcastle upon Tyne in October 1999. The work was encouraged and challenged, in equal measure, by my supervisor, Donald Hill. The only support not given by him (financial) was provided by an award from the Humanities Research Board of the British Academy. I have benefited greatly from the advice of students and staff at the Universities of Newcastle, Oxford, and St Andrews. No doubt many of them would be appalled to see their suggestions corrupted beyond recognition in what follows; it hardly needs saying that I take full responsibility for any inaccuracies. It seems to me that perhaps the same principle should be applied to acknowledgements as to the Heroidean manuscript tradition, viz. that it is more important to record suggestions than to single out prominent sources; but I make four exceptions: Adrian Hollis, on whose suggestion, and with whose continuing guidance, I embarked on a

study of these three richly rewarding poems; Jonathan Powell and Stephen Harrison, who, in providing reams of crucial suggestions, went far beyond the duties necessary for Ph.D. examiners; and Malcolm Campbell, who instructed me on the mechanics of publication.

I am, in addition, extremely grateful for the apparently inexhaustible patience of staff at the Robinson Library, Newcastle upon Tyne; at the Bodleian Library, Oxford; and at St Andrews University Library.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

Austin	Austin, C., *Nova fragmenta Euripidea in papyris reperta* (Berlin, 1968)
CE	Buecheler, F., *Carmina Latina Epigraphica* (Leipzig, 1897–)
CIL	*Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum* (Berlin, 1863–)
EGF	Davies, M., *Epicorum Graecorum Fragmenta* (Göttingen, 1988)
FLP	Courtney, E., *The Fragmentary Latin Poets* (Oxford, 1993)
H-S	Hofmann, J.B., Szantyr, A., *Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik* (Munich, 1965)
Jocelyn	Jocelyn, H.D., *The tragedies of Ennius: the fragments* (Cambridge, 1967)
K-S	Kühner, R., Stegmann, C., *Ausführliche Grammatik der Lateinischen Sprache* (Leverkusen, 1955)
LEV	Platnauer, M., *Latin Elegiac Verse* (Cambridge, 1951)
Lewis-Short	Lewis, C.T., Short, C., *A Latin Dictionary, founded on Andrews' Edition of Freund's Latin Dictionary* (Oxford, 1879)
LIMC	*Lexicon iconographicum mythologiae classicae* (Zurich, Munich, 1981–)
LSJ	Liddell, H.G., Scott, R., Jones, H.S., *A Greek Lexicon, 10th ed.* (Oxford, 1940)
Malcovati[2]	Malcovati, E., *Oratorum Romanorum fragmenta libera rei publicae, 2nd ed.* (Turin, 1955)
Merkelbach-West	Merkelbach, R., West, M.L., *Hesiodi Theogonia, Opera et Dies, Scutum . . . Fragmenta Selecta, 2nd ed.* (Oxford, 1983)
Nauck	Nauck, A., *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta* (Leipzig, 1889)
OLD	Glare, P.G.W., ed., *Oxford Latin Dictionary* (Oxford, 1982)
RE	Pauly, A.; Wissowa, G.; Kroll, W., *Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft* (Stuttgart, 1893–)

ROL	Warmington, E.H., *Remains of Old Latin* (Cambridge Mass., 1935–40)
Skutsch	Skutsch, O., *The Annals of Q. Ennius* (Oxford, 1985)
TLL	*Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* (Munich, 1900–)
TrGF	Snell, B., et al., *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta* (Göttingen, 1971–)
Vahlen^3	Vahlen, J., *Ennianae poesis reliquae, 3rd ed.* (Leipzig, 1903)
Watt	Watt, W.S., *M. Tulli Ciceronis Epistulae* (Oxford, 1958)

Abbreviations for ancient works, where used and where not self-explanatory, follow the conventions of *OLD* and *LSJ*; abbreviations for periodicals follow those in Marouzeau's *L'Année Philologique*. Except where it might cause ambiguity, the title of the work is omitted from references to the *Heroides*, and the name Ovid from references to all his works. Square brackets around an author's name before the title of the work indicate that that work's authenticity is suspect.

INTRODUCTION

Wrongthinking heroines and inquisitive readers

As soon . . . believe a woman or an epitaph
Or any other thing that's false, before
You trust in critics, who themselves are sore
(Byron, *English Bards and Scotch Reviewers*, 1.75–80)

. . . mulier cupido quod dicit amanti,
in vento et rapida scribere oportet aqua
(Catullus 70.3–4)

Ovid's heroines lost their innocence in 1984. Previous criticism of these poems centred almost exclusively on their rhetorical features, with some scholars even going so far as to regard them as versified *suasoriae.*[1] But Ovid himself draws attention to their epistolary nature: at *A.A.* 3.345 *vel tibi composita cantetur EPISTULA voce*, he expects his reader to know what work is signified by *epistula.*[2] Examination of the *Heroides* as epistles has produced interesting results.[3] Duncan Kennedy[4] considers Penelope's letter to Odysseus (*Her.* 1) as a letter—that is, as a document purporting to be written by a specific individual at a specific moment in time. He makes two important points. First, that the many deviations from the myth of Penelope and Odysseus as represented in Homer's *Odyssey* should be seen not as ignorance or wilful manipulation of the myth on the part of Ovid, but as ignorance or wilful manipulation of the myth on the part of Penelope. Second, details in the letter fix a specific time scale: the letter is written at a particular moment in the Homeric myth—namely, the moment when Odysseus has arrived in Ithaca disguised as a beggar. The reader is to see the Homeric myth as an objective backdrop to

[1] Knox intro. p. 15 gives a short but representative bibliography.

[2] The ancient title of the work is uncertain, but might have contained the word *epistulae*. See e.g. the bibliography given by Knox intro. p. 5 for a selection of views. The so-called 'double-letters' are best regarded as a separate entity, with either a separate title or none at all: see Kenney intro p. 1. For convenience, I refer to both the single and double letters as *Heroides*, abbreviation *Her.*

[3] The standard general work on modern epistolary theory is J.G. Altman (1982).

[4] D.F. Kennedy (1984).

the Ovidian Penelope's more subjective version. And so, when Penelope explains how she hopes to ensure that this letter will reach its addressee, by using as postman the next stranger to arrive in Ithaca (*Her.* 1.59ff.), Ovid's reader will strongly suspect that Penelope is about to hand over her letter to none other than the disguised Odysseus himself.

As Alessandro Barchiesi puts it, the reader of *Her.* 1 learns the rules for a new literary game.[5] Ovid encourages us to look beyond the confines of the epistle. The narrative context is to be found elsewhere.[6] In *Her.* 1, this narrative context is a single, extremely familiar text (Homer's *Odyssey*), and the game can be played at an elementary level. As the reader progresses through the epistles, the game can become progressively difficult. On reaching the epistles discussed here (11 Canace to Macareus, 13 Laodamia to Protesilaus, 14 Hypermestra to Lynceus), advanced gameplay can be expected.[7]

This picture of escalating 'difficulty' is complicated by uncertainties over the nature and order of the collection, book divisions, and over which of the epistles, if any, are spurious. It is widely agreed that Penelope's epistle is the first; after that, opinions vary wildly. The question of authenticity is particularly problematic, and it is hard to imagine any one view gaining universal acceptance. Suffice to say that appeals to *Am.* 2.18.21ff., where the poet gives a list of *Heroides* (1–2, 4–7, 10–11, 15), are unhelpful. It has been argued by some[8] that only these epistles are genuine; but the list need not be

[5] 'Così, la prima epistola del libro fornisce ai suoi lettori le delicate regole di un nuovo gioco letterario', A. Barchiesi (1987) 64.

[6] 'Infatti, questo contesto narrativo è fissato altrove, consegnato ai testi letterari (o più genericamente ai mitologemi) su cui Ovidio ha scelto di operare', op. cit. 65. Cf. Kennedy (1984) 414 on the double-letters, 'In the absence of an omniscient third-person narrator, we the readers must construct for ourselves the dramatic context of the exchange from details mentioned in passing by the two correspondents.'

[7] Kennedy (1984) 422 attempts to argue that the ancient reader would have been critically equipped to play such games; he refers to discussions on ἀναγνώρισις by the Homeric scholia. Ovid does, I think, introduce his reader gradually to the skills required for maximum enjoyment of the *Heroides*; but he could reasonably have assumed a readership already intimately familiar with the processes involved in writing and reading letters: exercises in letter-writing were part of Roman rhetorical training; and grammarians both Greek and Roman wrote on epistolary theory (see e.g. A. Malherbe (1988)). It seems that Ovid's *Heroides* could be performed as dramatic monologues (*A.A.* 3.345 *composita cantetur EPISTULA voce*), but that by no means precludes their being read as letters also.

[8] E.g. K. Lachmann (1848); cf. G.P. Goold (1974) 484; the argument gains the sympathy of Knox (intro. pp. 5ff.).

an exhaustive one, and might itself have been subjected to subsequent alteration or interpolation. Any argument can be advanced on the basis of such lists: Sappho's epistle is mentioned at *Am.* 2.18.26 and 34, but to suit their opinion that *Her.* 15 is spurious some scholars have imagined that the original is lost and what we possess is not by Ovid (see e.g. Knox intro. p. 7).[9] My own position on the *Heroides* considered here is that they are genuine, as far as it is possible to tell; at any rate, doubts can no longer rest on claims of 'inferior quality' (so e.g. Shuckburgh on 13, Riese on 14).

As for the order of the poems and their division into books, it is generally accepted that, if all fifteen of the single letters are genuine (and I remain largely unconvinced by arguments that any are spurious), they could not have been physically contained by a single papyrus-roll. The idea that they were divided into three books of five poems each[10] is attractive: this would give reasonable book lengths;[11] and division of poems into multiples of five seems to have been regular practice among Augustan poets.[12] Moreover, one thirteenth century and one fifteenth century manuscript mark such divisions.[13] Scholars have sought to determine an *Ordnungsprinzip*—a single thematic point to the order of the poems as they are transmitted. Dörrie[14] discerns an alternation between death and survival, Pulbrook[15] one between tragic and non-tragic heroines; Stroh draws parallels between the three books, noting thematic correspondances or subversions between heroines at the same point in their sequence.[16] None of these interpretations stands convincingly up to the facts. It is, I think, unwise to expect Ovidian ordering to be transparent.[17] I do not advance escalating contextual complexity as the *Ordnungsprinzip* of the *Heroides*, but suggest that it is a feature of the collection as transmitted.

[9] For a bibliography on questions of authenticity, see Dörrie intro. p. 29; for a recent discussion on methodology, see E. Courtney (1998).

[10] Suggested and supported by M. Pulbrook (1977).

[11] Dividing Dorrie's text into three five-poem books gives lengths of 752, 802, and 860 verses respectively.

[12] See e.g. J.C. McKeown (1987) 91f.

[13] See W. Stroh (1991) 204, T. Heinze (1997) 36.

[14] H. Dörrie (1967) 45.

[15] Pulbrook (1977) 35ff.

[16] See further Heinze (1997) 36f.

[17] Compare, for example, the complex range of 'ordering-principles' in the *Amores*, McKeown (1987) 90ff.

The three poems treated here come from the final book, if the three book theory is followed.[18] Canace (*Her.* 11) writes her letter to Macareus, her brother and lover, at a crucial point in the myth. The problem for the modern reader is that the narrative context is now largely lost; in particular, Euripides' *Aeolus* is not extant. Reconstruction of the mythological backdrop to the epistle can only be speculative, but is convincingly attempted by Gareth Williams and Sergio Casali.[19] Canace's version of events is in tension with that familiar to the reader. Canace knows only that she has given birth; that Macareus promised that they would marry; that her nurse suggested concealment of her child by Macareus; that her father Aeolus detected it and demanded the deaths of Canace and the child; and, as she writes, Canace is determined to carry out her father's orders and commit suicide. The reader knows that Macareus persuaded Aeolus to marry his daughters to his sons; that Canace gave birth and Macareus attempted to reassure her; that Aeolus used a lottery to decide which bride would go to which brother, and Canace was not assigned to Macareus; that Aeolus detected Canace's illegitimate child, and ordered her to commit suicide. These events are in the past as Canace writes her letter; the reader also knows what is happening as she writes, and what is to happen in the near future: Macareus is persuading Aeolus to reprieve Canace and the child; he rushes to deliver the news to Canace, but she has already committed suicide; Macareus will do the same. The child, whose death Canace graphically envisages (112ff.), will survive. The reader plays Canace's version of events off against the objective backdrop of the myth, and looks beyond the boundaries of the letter: forwards, towards the unnecessary deaths of the pair; but also sideways, to put a different interpretation from Canace's on the events that she relates (9–10n., 63–4n., 67n.). As Williams and Casali note, engagement with intertexts heightens the dramatic irony (9–10n., 113n., 116n.).[20] Characterisation contributes too. Canace seems naïve, an unequal partner in

[18] For commentaries on the other two epistles of the book, see Heinze (1997) and F. Bessone (1997) on 12 Medea to Jason, and Dörrie (1975) on 15 Sappho to Phaon.

[19] G. Williams (1992), S. Casali (1995).

[20] Intertextual play is rife in the *Heroides*: for instances of multiple allusion, usually regarded as a feature of later Latin poetry (see J.J.L. Smolenaars (1994) *passim*), see Index s.v. 'Multiple intertexts'.

her relationship with Macareus (27n., 39n., 59–64n.) and in thrall to her father (e.g. 8n.). The reader suspects that her passivity and ignorance will have a tragic outcome: unaware that her lover is working on her behalf behind the scenes, she is resolved to obey what she thinks are her father's orders.

The character of Laodamia (*Her.* 13) is perceived when the reader looks beyond the heroine's letter to a broad range of intertexts.[21] Laodamia is wrongthinking: wilfully misled and wilfully misleading. Almost everything in her account clashes with the versions familiar to the reader. She is wrong about the character of her husband Protesilaus, who has departed for the Trojan war (13.7ff.n., 65n., 79–82n., 93ff.n.); wrong about the Trojan war itself, about Paris (43–4n., 55–62n.), about Hector, her husband's killer (63–6n.), about the delay at Aulis (127–130n.), and even about the very landscape of Troy (53–4n.). She is preoccupied with omens, and manipulates mythical 'facts' to cover up the ominous blunders that she made in other versions of the myth (85–6n., 109–12n.); yet she overlooks a number of omens which the reader might spot (17–22n., 71–2n., 91–2n.), and her superstition will not save her husband's life.

In fact, the reader should perhaps regard Protesilaus as already dead. As in Penelope's letter, temporal markers in *Her.* 13 suggest at what point in the myth the heroine is to be imagined as writing. Mention of the wax image of Protesilaus sets the time of Laodamia's writing after her husband's death (149ff.n.). The reader looks beyond the boundaries of the epistle: the appearance of Protesilaus to Laodamia in a dream, of which Laodamia herself can make no sense, is to Ovid's reader the temporary reprieve from the underworld granted to Protesilaus in some versions of the myth (105–8n.); and Laodamia's attachment to the image may point forwards towards her death with it on a bonfire (149ff.n.).

Laodamia's dream is not a *reshaping* of Protesilaus' return from the dead, as some scholars have supposed (105–8n.).[22] To Ovid's reader, it *is* Protesilaus' return from the dead, misunderstood and misrepresented by the narrator, Laodamia. The reader will inevitably look

---

[21] Cf. Kennedy (1984) 421, on *Her.* 1, '. . . deviations from Homer serve to differentiate Ovid's characterization of Penelope.'

[22] Cf. M. Mayer (1885) 131, 'Die Pointe bei diesen Briefen liegt aber darin dass die von der Dichtung gegebenen Momente in einer ganz andern Situation geschikt verwerthet werden.'

to other tellings of the myth for a definitive version of events. The pre-Ovidian myth is not suppressed; rather, it is glimpsed behind the heroine's narrative.[23]

But the task of finding a definitive version will prove difficult, and not simply because the modern reader will have difficulties in reconstructing the myth.[24] Any attempt, by any reader, to provide a narrative context for the epistle must in the end be tentative. The reader can postulate a possible ending to the heroine's story, and a possible 'correct' interpretation for the events narrated by the heroine, but this cannot be definitive. Kennedy[25] writes of Ovid's 'trying to foreshadow future events for his readers through [the heroine's] words.' 'Trying' is not quite right. Ovid is toying with his reader, and playing with the idea of a 'definitive version' of a myth.

This is particularly the case in the penultimate letter of the collection (*Her.* 14). Hypermestra, the only daughter of Danaus not to carry out her father's orders to murder her groom on her wedding-night, writes to her groom, Lynceus, from her prison-cell. The reader familiar with the myth expects that, beyond the confines of the epistle, an eventual happy ending awaits the couple. Francis Cairns,[26] 'In all versions of the legend Lynceus and Hypermnestra lived happily ever after, ruled in Argos, founded a dynasty, and were buried together there', is broadly correct. However, different versions of the story provide different accounts of how that happy ending is reached: will Hypermestra be tried and acquitted, and her murderous sisters subsequently put on trial and reconciled (4n., 6–7n., 15n.)? Or will Lynceus simply murder the Danaids and/or their father (117n.)? And what will happen to Lynceus in the meantime (78n.)? Moreover, what exactly took place on the wedding-night, and why did Hypermestra spare Lynceus? Because she enjoyed their lovemaking, or

[23] 'E neppure si può dire che l'iniziativa del narratore arrivi qui a concepire una vera e propria sceneggiatura alternativa, utilizzando la storia tradizionale come un 'mondo possibile' su cui innestare nuove potenzialità. . . . La poetica delle *Eroidi* suggerisce, più semplicemente, che è possibile aprire nuove finestre su storie già compiute', Barchiesi (1987) 66.

[24] These difficulties are acute in the case of *Her.* 13. Versions of the myth are numerous and discrepant, and several important ones are not extant: see my intro. to Laodamia's epistle. Remarks in my commentary that concern the shape of the myth are unashamedly tentative. 'The critic, like the poet, can bring only finite resources to the infinity of discourse', S. Hinds (1998) 51.

[25] Kennedy (1984) 420.

[26] F. Cairns (1975) 136.

because sex did not take place at all, or for some other reason (4n.)? Ovid's reader will want answers to these questions, and will attempt to provide them by looking in Hypermestra's epistle for hints at familiar versions of the myth. But Hypermestra is not writing for the benefit of Ovid's reader; she is writing for the benefit of Lynceus, and her letter has a purpose—it is an appeal for rescue. She is unsure of how she stands with her addressee, and is therefore carefully elliptical about the details of the wedding night, and about her hopes for the future. Only she and Lynceus know whether or not they made love; and any references to sex will be aimed only at Lynceus. The prurient reader is eavesdropping; we might suspect that the couple made love on their wedding-night, but we cannot know for sure (42n., 55n., 123–4n.).

In the *Heroides*, the heroine and the poet work hand in hand. The particular heroine's personal agenda gives Ovid license to allude to various strands and elements of the myth, sometimes conflicting and contradictory, and to deviate from famous versions.[27] Incest was a major theme of the Canace myth, but Ovid's Canace seems to have little concern with it (11.23–6n.). Laodamia puts a new spin on the numbingly familiar details of the Trojan war; and Hypermestra does the same with Aeschylus' Danaid trilogy,[28] Horace *Carm.* 3.11, and the myth of Io.

Scholars have long been intrigued by the claim for the *Heroides* which Ovid puts into the mouth of an imaginary admirer at *A.A.* 3.346, *'ignotum hoc aliis ille novavit opus.'* Much ink has been spilt over why anyone might regard the *Heroides* as innovative, especially since Propertius seems to have beaten Ovid to something very similar with his Arethusa letter (4.3).[29] But an important difference between Ovid's heroines and Propertius' Arethusa is that the former bring with them a mythological baggage that the latter does not. Propertius' reader cannot play Arethusa's account of events off against other versions,

[27] Cf. e.g. Knox on the 'dynamic relationship between O.'s [seventh] epistle and the *Aeneid*', intro. pp. 20ff.

[28] The plays in order are *Supplices, Aegyptii, Danaides*. Only the first is extant.

[29] See e.g. Knox intro. p. 14 on innovation in *Her.* On the question of which came first, Propertius 4.3 or Ovid *Her.*, see Dörrie 28f. for a bibliography, and Knox 18. Propertius 4.3 is felt as an intertext in *Her.* 13 in particular: see 13.30n., 49–50n., 109–12n., 135ff.n., and H. Merklin (1968); both are letters addressed to a husband away at war.

because there are no other versions; the heroine is Propertius' invention.[30] Similarly, one might argue that the epistles found in certain episodes of Ovid's later work *Metamorphoses* do not pose the same challenge for the reader as *Her.* In *Met.*, the narrative context for a letter can be found in the main narrative surrounding it.[31] In *Her.*, the reader possesses only the letter, and has to look elsewhere for a narrative context.[32] Intertextual play is not peculiar to Ovid *Her.*; but the use Ovid makes of it within an epistolary framework is wholly innovative.

Text

'The text of *Heroides* is an unholy mess'—a recent expression of a universally accepted view.[33] The standard edition of the complete collection, produced by Heinrich Dörrie in 1971, is not highly regarded[34]—although it is greatly improved when the reviews by Reeve and Goold[35] are consulted alongside it. Textual matters therefore loom large for any commentator of the *Heroides*: The text given here (pp. 18–34) uses Dörrie's text as a starting point, and aims to improve upon it. Places where my printed text differs from that given by Dörrie are set out in the table below; in several other places, I make more tentative suggestions, or conclude that the arguments are

[30] If Arethusa and Lycotas, her addressee, are, as has been widely held, pseudonyms for a married couple known to Propertius, some readers would perhaps have found the narrative context for the epistle in the real lives of the real Arethusa and Lycotas.

[31] Thus e.g. in the case of Byblis' letter, *Met.* 9.530–563, the reader can view the *sequimur magnorum exempla deorum* (555) of the letter in the light of her previous *sunt superis sua iura! quid ad caelestia ritus/exigere humanos diversaque foedera tempto* (500–1), and can contrast her *timidis votis* (546) with her lurid dreams, her *obscenae flammae* (509) and her *insanos amores* (519).

[32] The situation changes somewhat in the 'double letters' (16–21), where the heroine's letter is set against not only the mythological backdrop, but also her addressee's reply.

[33] L. Morris (1999) 57.

[34] Judgements on Dörrie's ed. range from the polite ('meritoria ma non sempre attendibile', F. Bessone (1997) 43) to the brutally honest ('In 1971 appeared Heinrich Dörrie's elaborate edition with full apparatus criticus; but, lamentably, that apparatus is not critical nor is it to be trusted for what it says or implies, and the constitution of the text itself leaves everything to be desired', J.B. Hall (1990) 263).

[35] Goold (1974), M.D. Reeve (1974).

equally weighted. So corrupt is the ms. tradition[36] that no two editions will be at all alike, and no edition can claim to be definitive. Nevertheless, one must adopt a sound methodological approach. Some scholars have placed excessive faith in the ninth century ms. Parisinus 8242 (P).[37] While P is the best of a bad lot, and at times is alone in giving a correct reading or in preserving an earlier stage of corruption, it is capable of obvious (and sometimes spectacular) errors, as a glance at an apparatus will reveal.[38]

> [Palmer's] chief fault here is the fault which most editors now commit and plume themselves upon committing: he treats the best ms. as if it were better than it is, and sometimes prefers its authority to the thing on which authority is founded, reason.[39]

The *Heroides* is no place for conservative criticism. Dörrie singles out the older mss. by putting their sigla in bold type; but a more helpful distinction would be between the majority and minority of mss.[40]

> All inherently plausible readings, whatever their source, must be taken seriously, and sense and usage are the only sure criteria for deciding among them.[41]

The same rule must be applied to 'inherently plausible' conjectures. I give a selective apparatus, whose chief aim is to signal points of difficulty discussed in the commentary. In addition to indicating whether these reported readings are given by a minority or a majority of mss., I also, for information, single out Dörrie's chief mss., but only where their reading is of note (some noteable errors in P are recorded solely to demonstrate the fallibility of that ms.), and only where recorded by Dörrie or some other editor. I have consulted a photograph copy of P, and on occasion attempt to settle arguments

---

[36] *Her.* 1–14 and 16–21 are transmitted in what is, broadly speaking, the same tradition (see Knox intro. pp. 34f. for a summary of the details). *Her.* 15 is transmitted seperately.

[37] Also referred to as Puteaneus.

[38] For errors made by P and discussed in my commentary, see e.g. 11.55n., 11.61n., 69n., 78n., 130n., 13.2n., 13n., 73–4n., 108n., 135n., 163–4n., 14.4n., 22n., 27n., 99n., 123n.

[39] A.E. Housman (1899) 477. Cf. Reeve (1974) 58, 'The oldest manuscript, P (ninth century) is the most honest but by no means entirely honest, and it has no monopoly of truth.'

[40] 'Actually, what is important is readings, not manuscripts', Goold (1974) 476.

[41] R.J. Tarrant (1983) 270, recently quoted by Kenney intro. p. 27.

over what that ms. presents.[42] For that ms. alone, a question-mark in the apparatus represents my own uncertainty over a reading, and not that of Dörrie. For the readings of all other mss. I am reliant on the combined evidence of the editors: I give in my List of References details of editions consulted. Dörrie's edition in particular has a large number of errors and omissions in its apparatus.[43] A completely new recension of the mss. is required.[44] I refer on occasion to the Greek translation of *Her.* made by Planudes in the thirteenth century and transmitted in two mss. of the fifteenth. The text, with apparatus, is to be found in Palmer. The (theoretical) Latin ms. which Planudes translated deserves no more or less attention than any of the existing mss.[45] But Planudes was not, at this stage of his career at any rate, a particularly accomplished translator,[46] and some interesting peculiarities in his translation do not necessarily reflect interesting peculiarities in the ms. from which he was translating.[47]

Openings

How each letter begins is a contentious point. The question of so-called 'introductory couplets' has been greatly disputed.[48] It has regularly been regarded as a matter of ms. evidence. For 5–12 of the single epistles, and 17, 20, and 21 of the double epistles, the initial couplet is transmitted only in the minority tradition.[49] One view is that all those initial couplets transmitted in the minority tradition are spurious, and that all those transmitted in the entire tradition are genuine.[50] But ms. transmission may be a red herring. That a

---

[42] See 13.2n., 13.109–12n., 13.135n. *quae si*, 14.27n.

[43] Samples are given by Goold (1974) 476, Reeve (1973) 324, (1974) 58ff.

[44] And has been promised. See Hall (1990) 263.

[45] L. Purser (in Palmer, p. 51) claimed that 'the ms. of Planudes is often as good and sometimes better than P'; Housman (1899) 172 disagreed.

[46] Cf. Purser 47ff.

[47] See my notes on 11.96, 113 *rapidarum . . . ferarum*, 13.25–6, 65, 14.10.

[48] See esp. J. Vahlen (1881), W. Schmitz-Cronenbroech (1937), H. Dörrie (1960) 208–221, E.J. Kenney (1961), E.A. Kirfel (1969), Kenney (1970), Dörrie (ed.) 7–8, Goold (1974) 483–4, Jacobson (1974) 404–9, Tarrant (1983) 270–1.

[49] 'The witnesses supporting these additional couplets differ from poem to poem: those preceding 9, 10, and 12 appear only in the early printed editions, whereas those preceding 5, 6, and 7 are present in E, the second oldest manuscript (which breaks off at 7.159)', Tarrant loc. cit.

[50] So Goold and Tarrant; cf. Dörrie (ed.) pp. 7–8, who regards those in the minority tradition as spurious inventions made for an early edition.

couplet is spurious is not the only possible explanation for its incomplete transmission:

> Editors of *Her.* have always been puzzled by the 'extra' verses which are transmitted by a minority, whose membership fluctuates, of the recc.; they do not occur in the Carolingian stage of the tradition.... Their presence in the later tradition can hardly be due to direct 'vertical' transmission.... Some can be dismissed as demonstrable interpolations; those which seem good in themselves and necessary additions to the [text as transmitted in the main tradition] must, if Ovidian, come from a distinct branch (or branches...) of the tradition. One can only proceed by examining each passage on its merits....[51]

Any initial couplet, however it is transmitted, might be genuine or spurious.[52] For arguments on the specific merits and demerits of 11.1–2, 13.1–2, and 14.1–2 see nn.: I conclude that all three couplets are almost certainly genuine. There is, however, a general issue: what sort of techniques might Ovid have used to begin these epistles? Is there a grammar of opening in the *Heroides*?

Certain information must be conveyed to the reader near the beginning of the epistle if the intertextual game outlined above is to operate. The most basic piece of information required is the names of sender and addressee. This might have been conveyed by means of an 'envelope'—a superscription consisting of (at least) the two names.[53] Such superscriptions are found for all the epistles, in some form or other, in several mss., and some of them might be original. It would, of course, have been open to Ovid to vary the practice: heroine and addressee might be identified by means of an 'envelope' in some epistles, by means of an epistolary initial couplet in others.[54] It seems unlikely that any epistle would have both. But, in

[51] Tarrant, who nevertheless goes on to conclude that all the initial distichs in the minority tradition 'can be acounted for as interpolations designed to identify the sender and recipient of each "letter" in its opening words; the poems for which no additional verses survive are those in which this function is performed by first lines as generally transmitted.'

[52] So Kirfel, who considers the initial couplets of 1, 3, 4, 7, 8, 14–17 genuine, and of 2, 5, 6, 9–13, 18–21 spurious.

[53] Pointed out by Kenney (1961) 485.

[54] Cf. Goold (1974) 484, '[in the double letters] the poet does not include the details of his envelope; obviously for Letter 17 the title *Helena Paridi* is indispensible, just as for Letter 18 the inorganic distichs 18.Oab and 18.1f. each clumsily perform the function of LEANDER HERONI.' *Her.* 15, whether by Ovid or not, must have begun with an 'envelope': the heroine, Sappho, begins her letter by asking whether Phaon would have recognised her as the sender by her handwriting alone, had he not just read her name (on the 'envelope').

determining whether an introductory distich is genuine or whether the epistle began with an 'envelope', it can be no charge against the former that it is 'weak' or 'inorganic', charges levelled by Goold against the initial couplets transmitted in the minority tradition:

> What brands them as spurious is less their pedigree than their dramatic weakness and especially their failure to fit organically to the opening theme of the letter.[55]

A large part of the appeal of the *Heroides* stems from the conceit that the reader has, so to speak, intercepted and 'steamed open' an actual letter; and the more formulaic and 'inorganic' the letter's opening, the more that conceit is strengthened.[56] Ovid can at the same time use the form of the epistolary salutation as a *mise-en-scène* for his reader, drawing attention to important themes and signposting important intertexts.[57]

Background to each epistle

Commentaries on the *Heroides* regularly preface the notes on each epistle with a summary of that heroine's myth, and, for the convenience of the reader, I have followed suit. It should be noted, however, that these are broad synopses of the general shape of the myth For none of the heroines treated here is there a single unified backstory. Each reader brings to these epistles an individual set of various expectations regarding the myth. My notes on specific lines below suggest possible background details as signalled by the text.

---

[55] Goold (1974) 484.

[56] Cf. 11.4–6n. for possible play on the idea that the reader is in possession of a 'real' letter.

[57] See my nn. on the initial couplets. One might compare initial couplets in the *Epistulae ex Ponto*; cf. 13.1–2n. on *E.P.* 3.2.1–2.

TEXT

CONSPECTUS CODICUM

F	Francofurtanus Bibl. Univ. Ms. Barth. 110, saec. XII ex./ XIII in.
G	Guelferbytanus Extrav. 260, saec. XII
P	Parisinus Latinus 8242 ('Puteaneus'), saec. IX
V	Vaticanus Latinus 3254, saec. XII
W	Vindobonensis Bibl. Nat. ser. nov. 107, saec XII/XI ex. omittit 11.109–130; versuum 11.69–108 tantum initia extant.
ς	codices recentiores pauci vel unus
ω	codices recentiores omnes vel plures
codd.	codicum omnium consensus

SIGLA

exemplo utar codice F

F eras.	scriptura erasa est
F?	F non certo legitur
F^1	F ante correctionem
F^2	F post correctionem, vel eadem manu vel altera

COMPARATIVE TABLE

	Dörrie	*This edition*
11.1–2	[athetized]	[genuine]
11.11	ut	at
12	spectasset	spectaret
28	nescio quem sensi corde tepente deum	nescioquem sensi corde tremente deum
48	denaque	plenaque
61	aisti	dixti
66	et positum est	depositum est
69	frugibus	frondibus
78	fraxinus icta	fraxina virga
79	mea . . . pallentia	mea . . . pallentis
93	pectore plangi	pectora plangi
94	comas	genas
105	atrae	atras
111	si potuit meruisse necem, meruisse putetur	si potuit meruisse, necem meruisse putetur
113	rapidarum	rabidarum
127	in funere	in vulnera
130	perfer	perfice
13.1	mittit et optat amans, quo mittitur, ire salutem	mittit—et optat amans quo mittitur ire—salutem
4	A! me cum fugeres	a me cum fugeres
13	mandantis	mandatrix
14	potui	potuit
37–8	scilicet ipsa geram saturatas murice vestes, bella sub Iliacis moenibus ille gerat?	scilicet ipsa geram saturatas murice laenas? bella sub Iliacis moenibus ille gerit!
39–40	[genuine]	[spurious]
41	qua possum, squalore	quo possum, squalore
55	nisi se	nisi si
63–4	[genuine]	[spurious]
69	et facito ut dicas	et facito dicas
72	cadat	cadet
73a	[spurious]	[genuine]
74	[genuine]	[spurious]
79	es	est
91	nescio quem	nescioquem
98–9	[genuine]	[spurious]
100	tuo . . . litore	ipso . . . limine

108	cur venit a verbis multa querela tuis?	cur venit a labris muta querela tuis?
159–60	perque quod ut videam canis albere capillis, quod tecum possis ipse referre, caput	perque—quod, ut videam canis albere capillis, intactum possis ipse referre—caput
14.4	piam	piae
14	non est quam piget esse piam	non est, quam piget esse, pia
27	vocant	vocat
33	cibo	viri
42	quaeque tibi dederam vina, soporis erant	quaeque tibi dederam, causa soporis erant
47	tandem victa mei saeva formidine patris	admovi iugulo—sine me tibi vera fateri!—
61–2	aut meruere necem patruelia regna +tenendo+, quae tamen externis danda forent generis?	hanc meruere necem patruelia regna tenendo: cum sene nos inopi turba vagamur inops
64	piam	piae
80	abes	abest
82	facti sanguinis	pacti sanguinis
84	—haec meruit pietas praemia?—	—haec meruit pietas praemia!—
91	conatoque loqui	conatoque queri
99	possis	posses
113	[genuine]	[spurious]
114		[relocated to after 61]
120	quid fiet sonti, cum rea laudis agar?	—quid fiet sonti, cum rea laudis agar?—
125	vel fer opem	adfer opem

Lemata and line-numbers in the commentary refer to my text.

XI

Aeolis Aeolidae quam non habet ipsa salutem
  mittit et armata verba notata manu.
siqua tamen caecis errabunt scripta lituris,
  oblitus a dominae caede libellus erit.
dextra tenet calamum, strictum tenet altera ferrum,
  et iacet in gremio charta soluta meo.
haec est Aeolidos fratri scribentis imago;
  sic videor duro posse placere patri.
ipse necis cuperem nostrae spectator adesset,
  auctorisque oculis exigeretur opus.
at ferus est multoque suis truculentior Euris:
  spectaret siccis vulnera nostra genis.
scilicet est aliquid cum saevis vivere ventis:
  ingenio populi convenit ille sui.
ille Noto Zephyroque et Sithonio Aquiloni
  imperat et pinnis, Eure proterve, tuis.
imperat, heu, ventis, tumidae non imperat irae,
  possidet et vitiis regna minora suis!
quid iuvat admotam per avorum nomina caelo
  inter cognatos posse referre Iovem?
num minus infestum—funebria munera!—ferrum
  eminea teneo—non mea tela!—manu?
o utinam, Macareu, quae nos commisit in unum,
  venisset leto serior hora meo!
cur umquam plus me, frater, quam frater amasti,
  et tibi, non debet quod soror esse, fui?
ipsa quoque incalui, qualemque audire solebam,
  nescioquem sensi corde tremente deum:
fugerat ore color, macies adduxerat artus,
  sumebant minimos ora coacta cibos;

1–2 *habent* ς, *defenderunt edd. pauci*
11 at ς, *Riese*; ut *FPVW*ω; utque *G*
12 spectaret ς; spectasset *FGW*ω; spectat sed *P*; sed spectasset *V*
21 num *FGPVW*ς; non ω
28 tremente ς; tepente *FGPVW*ω; repente ς
29 adduxerat *PVW*ω; abduxerat *G*ς; obduxerat *F*ς; reduxerat ς

nec somni faciles, et nox erat annua nobis,
  et gemitum nullo laesa dolore dabam;
nec, cur haec facerem, poteram mihi reddere causam,
  nec noram quid amans esset; at illud eram.
prima malum nutrix animo praesensit anili,
  prima mihi nutrix 'Aeoli,' dixit 'amas!'
erubui, gremioque pudor deiecit ocellos:
  haec satis in tacita signa fatentis erant.
iamque tumescebant vitiati pondera ventris,
  aegraque furtivum membra gravabat onus.
quas mihi non herbas, quae non medicamina nutrix
  attulit audaci supposuitque manu,
ut penitus nostris (hoc te celavimus unum)
  visceribus crescens excuteretur onus!
a, nimium vivax admotis restitit infans
  artibus, et tecto tutus ab hoste fuit!
iam noviens erat orta soror pulcherrima Phoebi,
  plenaque luciferos Luna movebat equos.
nescia quae faceret subitos mihi causa dolores,
  et rudis ad partus et nova miles eram.
nec tenui vocem; 'quid,' ait, 'tua crimina prodis?'
  oraque clamantis conscia pressit anus.
quid faciam infelix? gemitus dolor edere cogit,
  sed Timor et nutrix et Pudor ipse vetant.
contineo gemitus elapsaque verba reprendo,
  et cogor lacrimas combibere ipsa meas.
Mors erat ante oculos et opem Lucina negabat,
  (et grave, si morerer, mors quoque crimen erat),
cum superincumbens scissa tunicaque comaque
  pressa refovisti pectora nostra tuis,
et mihi 'vive soror, soror o carissima' dixti,
  'vive, nec unius corpore perde duos!

---

34 eram *F²PW*ω; erat *F¹GV*ς
39 tumescebant . . . pondera *codd.*; tumescebam . . . pondere *Heinsius*
45 a *FGPVW*ω; at ς (ast), *Naugerius*; hac ς; heu ς
48 plenaque *Gronovius*; denaque *GVW*ω; nonaque *FP*ς; penaque ς
55 contineo *W*ς; continuo *FGPV*ω
61 dixti (disti, dixsti) *F*ω; aisti *GPV*ς

spes bona det vires: fratri nam nupta futura es;
  illius, de quo mater, et uxor eris.'
mortua, crede mihi, tamen ad tua verba revixi;
  depositum est uteri crimen onusque mei.
quid tibi grataris? media sedet Aeolus aula:
  crimina sunt oculis subripienda patris.
frondibus infantem ramisque albentis olivae
  et levibus vitiis sedula celat anus,
fictaque sacra facit dicitque precantia verba;
  dat populus sacris, dat pater ipse viam.
iam prope limen erat: patrias vagitus ad aures
  venit, et indicio proditur ille suo.
eripit infantem mentitaque sacra revelat
  Aeolus; insana regia voce sonat.
ut mare fit tremulum, tenui cum stringitur aura,
  ut quatitur tepido fraxina virga Noto,
sic mea vibrari pallentis membra videres;
  quassus ab imposito corpore lectus erat.
inruit, et nostrum vulgat clamore pudorem,
  et vix a misero continet ore manus.
ipsa nihil praeter lacrimas pudibunda profudi:
  torpuerat gelido lingua retenta metu.
iamque dari parvum canibusque avibusque nepotem
  iusserat in solis destituique locis.
vagitus dedit ille miser (sensisse putares),
  quaque suum poterat voce rogabat avum.
quid mihi tunc animi credis, germane, fuisse
  (nam potes ex animo colligere ipse tuo),

63 det *GP^2VWω*; dat *Fς*, *florilegia quaedam*
63 fratri nam nupta futura es *FGWω*; fratris nam nupta futura es ς, *Palmer, P^1?*; fratri es nam nupta futura *P^2ς*; germani nupta futura es ς, *Bentley*; germano nupta futura es *Ehwald*; fratri vis nubere? nube *Vς*; nupta tibi credito verbis ς; fratri tibi nubere sit spes ς
64 illius de quo mater et *FGPVWω*; illius es de quo mater et ς, *Heinsius*; illius de quo mater es ς, *Reeve*
66 depositum est *scripsi*; et positum est *codd.*; depositumque *Burman*; expositum est ς
69 frondibus *FGVWω* (frodibus *V*, fronbus ς, frundibus ς); frugibus *Pς*
78 fraxina virga *FGP^2Vω*; fraxincies virga *P^1*; flexina virga ς; maxima virga ς; fraxinus icta *Palmer*; fraxinus acta *Sedlmayer*; fagina virga *Birt*; fraxinus alta *Giomini*
79 mea . . . pallentis *Heinsius*; mihi . . . pallentia ς; mea . . . pallentia *FGPVω*
90 nam *FGPVω*; iam ς; et ς; non *Wilamowitz*

cum mea me coram silvas inimicus in altas
  viscera montanis ferret edenda lupis?
exierat thalamo: tum demum pectora plangi
  contigit inque meas unguibus ire genas.
interea patrius vultu maerente satelles
  venit, et indignos edidit ore sonos:
'Aeolus hunc ensem mittit tibi' (tradidit ensem),
  'et iubet ex merito scire quid iste velit.'
scimus, et utemur violento fortiter ense;
  pectoribus condam dona paterna meis.
his mea muneribus, genitor, conubia donas?
  hac tua dote, pater, filia dives erit?
tolle procul, decepte, faces, Hymenaee, maritas,
  et fuge turbato tecta nefanda pede!
ferte faces in me quas fertis, Erinyes, atras,
  et meus ex isto luceat igne rogus!
nubite felices parca meliore, sorores,
  amissae memores sed tamen este mei!
quid puer admisit tam paucis editus horis?
  quo laesit facto vix bene natus avum?
si potuit meruisse, necem meruisse putetur;
  a, miser admisso plectitur ille meo!
nate, dolor matris, rabidarum praeda ferarum,
  ei mihi, natali dilacerate tuo,
nate, parum fausti miserabile pignus amoris,
  haec tibi prima dies, haec tibi summa fuit!
non mihi te licuit lacrimis perfundere iustis,
  in tua non tonsas ferre sepulchra comas;
non superincubui, non oscula frigida carpsi:
  diripiunt avidae viscera nostra ferae.

---

91 inimicus *codd.*; immitis *Bentley*
93 tum *V*ς; tunc *FP*ω
93 demum *FPV*ω; denique ς
93 plangi P^1V^1ς; planxi F^2GP^2ω
94 genas P^2Vς; comas *FG*ς; *eras.* P^1
101 donas *codd.*; dotas *Burman*
105 atras *Burman*; atrae *codd.*
107–8 *spurios putavit Bornecque-Prévost*
108 amissae F^1GPς; admissi F^2ω; amissi *V*ς
113 rabidarum ς; rapidarum *FGPV*ω

ipsa quoque infantis cum vulnere prosequar umbras;
nec mater fuero dicta nec orba diu.
tu tamen, o frustra miserae sperate sorori,
sparsa, precor, nati collige membra tui,
et refer ad matrem, socioque impone sepulchro,
urnaque nos habeat quamlibet arta duos.
vive memor nostri, lacrimasque in vulnera funde,
neve reformida corpus amantis amans.
tu, rogo, dilectae nimium mandata sororis
perfice; mandatum persequar ipsa patris.

---

121 vulnere *codd.*; *fortasse* funere
121 prosequar *FGPV*ω; persequar ς
127 130 *spurios putavit Bornecque-Prévost*
127 vulnera ς; vulnere *F*ς; vulner/*P*; funera ς; funere G^2ς; fulnere G^1
129–130 *spurios putaverunt Heinsius et edd. alii*
129 tu rogo dilectae F^1G; tu rogo proiectae F^2P^2Vω; tura rogo placitae *Palmer*; *eras.* P^1
130 perfice ς *Slichtenhorst*; perfer *FGPV*ω; profer ς
130 mandatum persequar FP^2ς; mandatis persequar P^1ς; mandatis perfruar *GV*ω; mandatum prosequar ς; mandatis opsequar *Housman*; *fortasse* mandatum perficit

XIII

mittit—et optat amans quo mittitur ire—salutem
Haemonis Haemonio Laodamia viro.
Aulide te fama est vento retinente morari;
a me cum fugeres, hic ubi ventus erat?
tum freta debuerant vestris obsistere remis,
illud erat saevis utile tempus aquis.
oscula plura viro mandataque plura dedissem,
et sunt quae volui dicere multa tibi.
raptus es hinc praeceps, et qui tua vela vocaret,
quem cuperent nautae, non ego, ventus erat.
ventus erat nautis aptus, non aptus amanti;
solvor ab amplexu, Protesilae, tuo.
linguaque mandatrix verba imperfecta reliquit;
vix illud potuit dicere triste vale.
incubuit Boreas, abreptaque vela tetendit,
iamque meus longe Protesilaus erat.
dum potui spectare virum, spectare iuvabat,
sumque tuos oculos usque secuta meis;
ut te non poteram, poteram tua vela videre,
vela diu vultus detinuere meos;
at postquam nec te nec vela fugacia vidi,
et quod spectarem nil nisi pontus erat,
lux quoque tecum abiit, tenebrisque exsanguis obortis
succiduo dicor procubuisse genu.
vix socer Iphiclus, vix me grandaevus Acastus,
vix mater gelida maesta refecit aqua.
officium fecere pium sed inutile nobis:

1–2 *habent codd. omnes; spurios putaverunt edd. plures. sic pupugit Micyllus*
2 Laodamia *FGPV*ω; Laudomia *W apud Palmer*
4 a me *Madvig, Ehwald*; ah! me *edd. plures.*; at me *Heinsius*
8 multa *FGPV*ω; plura *W*ς
13 mandatrix *Heinsius*; mandantis ς; mandatis *FGPVW*ω
13 reliquit *FGPVW*ω; relinquit ς
14 potuit dicere ς; potui dicere *FGVW*ω; dicere potui *P*
15 abreptaque *FGPVW*ς; arreptaque ς
25 Iphiclus *P*; yphidus *G*ς; ysiphidus ς; ysiphilus ς; yphiocus ς; Ὑψίπυλος *Planudes*
25 Acastus] adrastus ς; achates ς

indignor miserae non licuisse mori.
ut rediit animus, pariter rediere dolores;
pectora legitimus casta momordit amor.
nec mihi pectendos cura est praebere capillos,
nec libet aurata corpora veste tegi.
ut quas pampinea tetigisse Bicorniger hasta
creditur, huc illuc, qua furor egit, eo.
conveniunt matres Phylleides et mihi clamant:
'indue regales, Laodamia, sinus!'
scilicet ipsa geram saturatas murice laenas?
bella sub Iliacis moenibus ille gerit!
[ipsa comas pectar? galea caput ille prematur?
ipsa novas vestes, dura vir arma ferat?]
quo possum, squalore tuos imitata labores
dicar, et haec belli tempora tristis agam.
Dyspari Priamide, damno formose tuorum,
tam sis hostis iners quam malus hospes eras!
aut te Taenariae faciem culpasse maritae,
aut illi vellem displicuisse tuam.
tu qui pro rapta nimium, Menelae, laboras,
ei mihi, quam multis flebilis ultor eris!
di, precor, a nobis omen removete sinistrum,
et sua det reduci vir meus arma Iovi!
sed timeo quotiens subiit miserabile bellum;
more nivis lacrimae sole madentis eunt.
Ilion et Tenedos Simoisque et Xanthus et Ide
nomina sunt ipso paene timenda sono.

---

29 ut rediit animus *PVW*ς; ut rediitque animus ς; ut redeunt animi ς; utque animus rediit *FG*ς
35 Phylleides *Heinsius*, *P*[1]*?* ς; Phylaceides *GP*[2]ω
36 Laodamia] Laudamina *P*
37 laenas *Burman*; vestes *FGPVW*ω; lanas ς; telas *Hall*
38 bella *codd.*; tela *Hall*
38 gerit ς; gerat *FVW*ς; geret *G*ω; *P non legitur*
39–40 *spurios puto*
39 prematur *F*[2]*GVW*ς; prematur *F*[1]ω; *P non legitur*
40 novas] leves *Hall*
40 ferat *W*ς; feret *FGV*ω; gerat ς; geret ς; *P non legitur*
41 quo *P*[2]*V*ω; qua *FGP*[1]*W*ς; *fortasse* quod
43 Dyspari ς, *Hubertinus*; dux Pari *FGPVW*ω
47 laboras *FGPVW*ω; dolebas ς

nec rapere ausurus, nisi si defendere posset,
  hospes erat: vires noverat ille suas.
venerat, ut fama est, multo spectabilis auro,
  quique suo Phrygias corpore ferret opes,
classe virisque potens, per quae fera bella geruntur—
  et sequitur regni pars quota quemque sui?
his ego te victam, consors Ledaea gemellis,
  suspicor, haec Danais posse nocere puto.
[Hectora nescioquem timeo: Paris Hectora dixit
  ferrea sanguinea bella movere manu;]
Hectora, quisquis is est, si sum tibi cara, caveto;
  signatum memori pectore nomen habe!
hunc ubi vitaris, alios vitare memento,
  et multos illic Hectoras esse puta,
et facito dicas, quotiens pugnare parabis:
  'parcere me iussit Laodamia sibi.'
si cadere Argolico fas est sub milite Troiam,
  te quoque non ullum vulnus habente cadet.
pugnet et adversos tendat Menelaus in hostes,
  ut rapiat Paridi quam Paris ante sibi. 73a
[irruat, et causa quem vincit, vincat et armis; 73b
  hostibus e mediis nupta petenda viro est.]
causa tua est dispar: tu tantum vivere pugna
  inque pios dominae posse redire sinus!

---

55 si *Burman*; se *codd.*; eam *Francius*
59 60 *spurios putaverunt Damsté et Bornecque-Prévost*
60 quota quemque *GP*^{1}*VW*ω; quotacumque *P*^{2}; quotaquaeque *Burman*, ς
61 Ledaea *FGP*^{2}*VW*ω; *om. P*^{1}; Ledaei *Heinsius, Bentley*
63–4 *spurios puto secundum edd. quosdam*
65 cara *F*^{2}*GPVW*ω; cura ς
69 et facito dicas *Heinsius*, ς; et facito ut dicas *FGPVW*ω; et tacitus dicas *Bentley*; et tacito *vel* tacite dicas *Burman*
69 pugnare *FGPVW*ω; bellare *Heinsius*, ς
72 quoque non ullum *FGPW*ω; voveo nullum *vel* modo non ullum *Francius*; quoque sed nullum *Burman*, ς; certe nullum *Hall*
72 cadet *Bentley*, ς; cadat *FGPVW*ω
73 73a 75, *om.* 73b 74 *F*^{1}ς, *Housman*; 73 74 75, *om.* 73a 73b *GPW*ς, *edd. paene omnes*; 73 73a 74 75, *om.* 73b ς; *om.* 73a 73b 74, *lacunam inter* 73 *et* 75 *posuit Dörrie*
73b irruat et causa quem vincit vincat et armis *vel sim. V*ς; ictibus adversis poscat sua munera fortis ς; pugnando moliet quantum iam diligit illam ς; arma ferat frigio fraudatus ab hoste maritus ς; hostis et invadat thalamos helenamque reducat ς
75 causa tua est dispar *FGPVW*ω; causa tuae dispar *Heinsius*
76 pios *FGP*^{2}*VW*ω; pius *P*^{1}

parcite, Dardanidae, de tot, precor, hostibus uni,
  ne meus ex illo corpore sanguis eat!
non est quem deceat nudo concurrere ferro
  saevaque in oppositos pectora ferre viros.
fortius ille potest multo, quam pugnat, amare;
  bella gerant alii, Protesilaus amet!
nunc fateor: volui revocare, animusque ferebat;
  substitit auspicii lingua timore mali.
cum foribus velles ad Troiam exire paternis,
  pes tuus offenso limine signa dedit.
ut vidi, ingemui, tacitoque in pectore dixi:
  'signa reversuri sint, precor, ista viri!'
haec tibi nunc refero, ne sis animosus in armis;
  fac meus in ventos hic timor omnis eat!
sors quoque nescioquem fato designat iniquo,
  qui primus Danaum Troada tangat humum.
infelix, quae prima virum lugebit ademptum!
  di faciant ne tu strenuus esse velis!
inter mille rates tua sit millesima puppis,
  iamque fatigatas ultima verset aquas!
hoc quoque praemoneo: de nave novissimus exi,
  [non est, quo properes, terra paterna tibi.
cum venies, remoque move veloque carinam,]
  inque ipso celerem limine siste gradum!
sive latet Phoebus seu terris altior exstat,
  tu mihi luce dolor, tu mihi nocte venis;
nocte tamen quam luce magis: nox grata puellis,

---

79 est *codd.*; es *Palmer*
80–1 *spurios putavit Palmer*
81 potest . . . quam . . . amare P^1ς; potest . . . qui (*vel* quam *vel* cui) . . . amore *FGP*^{2}*VW*ω; potest . . . quum . . . amore *Heinsius*; facit . . . quum . . . amore *Burman*
87 ut vidi ingemui *FGPVW*ω; ut vidi ut gemui *Heinsius*; ut vidi et gemui ς; ut vidi gemui ς
88 reversuri *FGPV*ω; recursuri ς, *Burman*
90 fac meus . . . hic timor *FGPVW*ω; fac meus . . . hinc timor ς; fac meus . . . ut timor ς; irritus . . . fac timor *Burman 'in Vosii excerptis'*
92 tangat *FGPVW*ς; tangit ς; tanget ς
98–9 *spurios puto*
98 properes *FGPV*ω; properas *W*ς
100 ipso . . . limine *scripsi*; tuo . . . litore *codd.*
102 dolor . . . venis *codd.*; memor *vel* precor . . . veni *Bentley*; celer . . . veni *nescioquis*

quarum suppositus colla lacertus habet.
  aucupor in lecto mendaces caelibe somnos;
dum careo veris, gaudia falsa iuvant.
  sed tua cur nobis pallens occurrit imago?
cur venit a labris muta querela tuis?
  excutior somno, simulacraque noctis adoro;
nulla caret fumo Thessalis ara meo.
  tura damus lacrimamque super, qua sparsa relucet,
ut solet adfuso surgere flamma mero.
  quando ego te reducem cupidis amplexa lacertis
languida laetitia solvar ab ipsa mea?
  quando erit ut lecto mecum bene iunctus in uno
militiae referas splendida facta tuae?
  quae mihi dum referes, quamvis audire iuvabit,
multa tamen rapies oscula, multa dabis.
  semper in his apte narrantia verba resistunt;
promptior est dulci lingua refecta mora.
  sed cum Troia subit, subeunt ventique fretumque;
spes bona sollicito victa timore cadit.
  hoc quoque, quod venti prohibent exire carinas,
me movet; invitis ire paratis aquis.
  quis velit in patriam vento prohibente reverti?
a patria pelago vela vetante datis.
  ipse suam non praebet iter Neptunus ad urbem.
quo ruitis? vestras quisque redite domos!
  quo ruitis Danai? ventos audite vetantes!
non subiti casus, numinis ista mora est.

---

108 cur venit a labris muta querela tuis *scripsi*; cur venit a verbis multa querela tuis *FGP*^{2}*VW*ω; cur venit a verbis multo querellatens *P*^{1}; cur venit a labris multa querela tuis *Jackson*; cur venit, a verbis muta, querela latens *Palmer*; cur venit a! verbis multa querela carens *Baehrens*; cur venit ah! verbis multa querela latens *Palmer*; cur venit a vobis multa querela latens *Palmer*; cur venit ah! verbis multa querela tuis *Madvig*
111 lacrimamque *FGPVW*ω, *edd.*; lacrimasque ς
111 qua sparsa relucet *F*ω; quae sparsa relucet *W*^{2}ς, *Giomini*; quae sparsa relucent *G apud Palmer et Giomini*, ς; quae a relucet *P*^{1}; quis ara relucet *P*^{2}, *D. Heinsius*; sparsa relucet *V*ς; qua sacra relucet *Palmer*; quae inpersa *vel* aspersa relucet *Giomini*
118 rapies *FGP*^{2}*VW*ω; capies ς, *Heinsius*; rapites *P*^{1}; *fortasse* carpes
119 verba resistunt *codd.*; labra resistent *Bentley*
120 refecta *Francius*; retenta ς; referre *VW*ω; refere *P*; referta *G*ς
127 128 129 130 *hunc ordinem praebent FGPVW*ω; 129 128 127 130 ς; *alii alios ordines praebent*
128 vestras . . . domos] vestram domum ς

quid petitur tanto nisi turpis adultera bello?
  dum licet, Inachiae vertite vela rates!
sed quid ago? revoco? revocaminis omen abesto,
  blandaque compositas aura secundet aquas!
Troasin invideo: quae si lacrimosa suorum
  funera conspicient nec procul hostis erit,
ipsa suis manibus forti nova nupta marito
  imponet galeam Dardanaque arma dabit.
arma dabit, dumque arma dabit, simul oscula sumet
  —hoc genus officii dulce duobus erit—
producetque virum, dabit et mandata reverti,
  et dicet: 'referas ista fac arma Iovi!'
ille ferens dominae mandata recentia secum
  pugnabit caute, respicietque domum.
exuet haec reduci clipeum, galeamque resolvet,
  excipietque suo corpora lassa sinu.
nos sumus incertae, nos anxius omnia cogit,
  quae possunt fieri, facta putare timor.
dum tamen arma geres diverso miles in orbe,
  quae referat vultus est mihi cera tuos.
illi blanditias, illi tibi debita verba
  dicimus, amplexus accipit illa meos.
crede mihi, plus est, quam quod videatur, imago;
  adde sonum cerae, Protesilaus erit.
hanc specto, teneoque sinu pro coniuge vero,
  et, tamquam possit verba referre, queror.
per reditus corpusque tuum, mea numina, iuro,

133 sed quid ago? revoco? *Merkel*; *edd. aliis aliter visum est (vide n.)*; si quid ago revoco P^1; si quid ego revoco P^2; sed quid ego haec revoco ς; sed quid ago revocans *GW*ς; *om.* revoco *vel sim.* ς
133 revocaminis omen *Heinsius*, *Bentley*; omen revocaminis ς; omen revocantis *GW*ς; revocantis omen *V*ς; [ ]s omen P^1; revocantis et omen P^2; *om.* ς; revocantibus omen ς; revocatibus omen *Heinsius*
135 Troasin *Salmasius*; Tro(i)adas *FGVW*ω; Troas *P*
135 quae si *Heinsius ex P ut falso credidit, Ehwald*; quae sic *codd.*; quamvis *Bentley*; quod si *Hollis*
139–140 *spurios putavit Palmer*
145 clipeum galeamque *FGPVW*ω; galeam clipeumque ς
146 corpora *FGPVW*ω; pectora ς, *Burman*
147 nos anxius *codd.*; saepe anxius *florilegia quaedam*
149 geres *P*ς; geras *FGW*ς; geris *V*ς; feres ς; feras ς

perque pares animi coniugiique faces,
  perque—quod, ut videam canis albere capillis,
intactum possis ipse referre—caput,
  me tibi venturam comitem, quocumque vocaris,
sive—quod heu timeo!—sive superstes eris.
  ultima mandato claudetur epistula parvo:
si tibi cura mei, sit tibi cura tui!

159–160 *spurios putaverunt edd. quidam*
159 ut FGP^2 *(add. glossemam* utinam*)* W^2ω; o ς, *Heinsius*; *om.* P^1VW^1ς
160 intactum *Watt*; quod tecum *codd.*, *defendit Vahlen*; o *vel* huc tecum *Heinsius*; tu tecum *Bentley*; tu *vel* mox tutum *vel* laetum *Riese*; integrum *Birt*; mox sospes *Sedlmayer*; protectum *Housman*; hoc salvum *Reeve*
163–164 *spurios putaverunt edd. quidam*
164 si P^1Wς; sit FGP^2Vω; sic ς

XIV

mittit Hypermestra de tot modo fratribus uni;
  cetera nuptarum crimine turba iacet.
clausa domo teneor gravibusque coercita vinclis;
  est mihi supplicii causa fuisse piae.
quod manus extimuit iugulo demittere ferrum,
  sum rea; laudarer, si scelus ausa forem.
esse ream praestat quam sic placuisse parenti;
  non piget immunes caedis habere manus.
me pater igne licet, quem non violavimus, urat,
  quaeque aderant sacris, tendat in ora faces,
aut illo iugulet, quem non bene tradidit ensem,
  ut, qua non cecidit vir nece, nupta cadam.
non tamen ut dicant morientia 'paenitet!' ora
  efficiet: non est, quam piget esse, pia.
paeniteat sceleris Danaum saevasque sorores;
  hic solet eventus facta nefanda sequi.
cor pavet admonitu temeratae sanguine noctis,
  et subitus dextrae praepedit ossa tremor;
quam tu caede putes fungi potuisse mariti,
  scribere de facta non sibi caede timet.
sed tamen experiar. modo facta crepuscula terris;
  ultima pars lucis primaque noctis erat.
ducimur Inachides magni sub tecta Pelasgi,

1–2 *habent codd. omnes; spurios putaverunt edd. plures*
1 Hypermestra] Hypermnestre ς
4 piae *Heinsius, Bentley*; piam *codd.*; pium *florilegia quaedam*
5 demittere ς, *Burman*; dimittere *FGPVW*ω
10 tendat *codd.*; trudat *Nissen*
11 ensem *GPW*ς; ense *FV*ς
12 cadam *FGPVW*ω; cadat ς
13 dicant morientia . . . ora *codd.*; dicam morienti . . . ore *Francius*
14 non est quam piget esse pia *Bentley*; non est quam piget esse piam *GPW*ω; non sum quam piget esse piam ς; non es quam piget esse piam ς, *Heinsius*; non es cui piget esse piam ς, *Burman*
18 praepedit *FGPVW*[1]ω; concutit *W*[2]ς
18 ossa *GPVW*ω; orsa ς, *Naugerius*
22 lucis . . . noctis *FGVW*ω; noctis . . . lucis *P*ς, *defendit Heinsius*
23 Pelasgi *FGPVW*ω; tyranni ς, *Haupt*

et socer armatas accipit ipse nurus.
  undique conlucent praecinctae lampades auro;
dantur in invitos impia tura focos;
  vulgus 'Hymen, Hymenaee!' vocat; fugit ille vocantes;
ipsa Iovis coniunx cessit ab urbe sua.
  ecce mero dubii, comitum clamore frequentes,
flore novo madidas impediente comas,
  in thalamos laeti—thalamos sua busta!—feruntur,
strataque corporibus funere digna premunt.
  iamque viri vinoque graves somnoque iacebant,
securumque quies alta per Argos erat;
  circum me gemitus morientum audire videbar—
et tamen audibam, quodque verebar erat.
  sanguis abit, mentemque calor corpusque relinquit,
inque novo iacui frigida facta toro.
  ut leni Zephyro graciles vibrantur aristae,
frigida populeas ut quatit aura comas,
  aut sic aut etiam tremui magis. ipse iacebas,
quaeque tibi dederam, causa soporis erant.
  excussere metum violenti iussa parentis;
erigor, et capio tela tremente manu.
  non ego falsa loquar: ter acutum sustulit ensem,
ter male sublato recidit ense manus;
  admovi iugulo—sine me tibi vera fateri!—

---

24 et *codd.*; nec *Birt*
27 vocat *FG*ς; vocant *PVW*ω
31 laeti thalamos *FGPW*; laeti iuvenes ς; laeti fratres ς; laeti patrios ς; laeti ς
32 corporibus funere digna *codd.*; funeribus corpore dicta *Burman*; corporibus tempore digna *Damsté*; nequaquam funere digna *Hall*
33 viri *scripsi*; cibo *FGPW*ω; ciboque *V*ς
36 audibam *PW*ς; audieram *FG(?), Bentley, edd. quidam*
36 verebar *codd.*; vererer *Heinsius*
39 ut leni *PW*ς; utque levi *FV*ω
39 graciles *FGPVW*ω; fragiles ς
42 quaeque tibi dederam causa soporis erant ς, *Damsté*; quaeque tibi dederam vina soporis [saporis P^1] erant FGP^2Wω; quaeque tibi dederam plena soporis erant *Palmer*; quaeque tibi dederam iuncta soporis erant *Birt*; quemque tibi dederant vina soporis eras *Postgate*; causaque quae dederam vina soporis erant *Diggle*
43 iussa FGP^2VW; causa P^1
46 male *codd.*; mea *Damsté*
46 recidit G^1*(?)W, Heinsius*; decidit G^2P^2ς
47 admovi iugulo sine me tibi (*vel* liceat mihi) vera fateri *GPW*ς; tandem victa mei saeva formidine patris ς; at rursus monitis iussuque coacta parentis *V* (et rursus) ς

admovi iugulo tela paterna tuo;
  sed timor et pietas crudelibus obstitit ausis,
castaque mandatum dextra refugit opus.
  purpureos laniata sinus, laniata capillos,
exiguo dixi talia verba sono:
  'saevus, Hypermestra, pater est tibi; iussa parentis
effice; germanis sit comes iste suis!'
  'femina sum et virgo, natura mitis et annis;
non faciunt molles ad fera tela manus.'
  'quin age, dumque iacet, fortes imitare sorores!
credibile est caesos omnibus esse viros.'
  'si manus haec aliquam posset committere caedem,
morte foret dominae sanguinolenta suae.'
  'hanc meruere necem patruelia regna tenendo;
cum sene nos inopi turba vagamur inops.' 114
  'finge viros meruisse mori, quid fecimus ipsae?
quo mihi commisso non licet esse piae?
  quid mihi cum ferro? quo bellica tela puellae?
aptior est digitis lana colusque meis.'
  haec ego, dumque queror, lacrimae sua verba sequuntur,
deque meis oculis in tua membra cadunt.
  dum petis amplexus sopitaque bracchia iactas,
paene manus telo saucia facta tua est.
  iamque patrem famulosque patris lucemque timebam;
expulerunt somnos haec mea dicta tuos:
  'surge age, Belide, de to modo fratribus unus!
nox tibi, ni properas, ista perennis erit.'
  territus exsurgis, fugit omnis inertia somni,
adspicis in timida fortia tela manu;
  quaerenti causam 'dum nox sinit, effuge!' dixi,
'dum nox atra sinit, tu fugis, ipsa moror.'
  mane erat, et Danaus generos ex caede iacentes

---

57 iacet $F^1GPW\omega$; licet $F^2V\varsigma$; placet ς
60 morte *codd.*; caede ς, *Hall*
61 hanc ς; at ς; aut $P^1VW\omega$
61 114 63, *om.* 62 [= quae tamen externis danda forent generis *vel. sim.*] P^1*? (eras.)* ς, *Housman; idem facit sed post* 118 *locat W*
64 piae *P*; piam $FGVW\omega$
69 amplexus *codd.*; amplexu *Heinsius*
72 expulerunt $P^1\varsigma$; expulerant $FGP^2VW\omega$
77–78 *sic pupugit Merkel*

dinumerat: summae criminis unus abest.
fert male cognatae iacturam mortis in uno,
et queritur pacti sanguinis esse parum.
abstrahor a patriis pedibus, raptamque capillis
—haec meruit pietas praemia!—carcer habet.
scilicet ex illo Iunonia permanet ira
quo bos ex homine est, ex bove facta dea;
at satis est poenae teneram mugisse puellam
nec modo formosam posse placere Iovi.
adstitit in ripa liquidi nova vacca parentis,
cornuaque in patriis non sua vidit aquis,
conatoque queri mugitus edidit ore,
territaque est forma, territa voce sua.
quid furis, infelix? quid te miraris in unda?
quid numeras factos ad nova membra pedes?
illa Iovis magni paelex metuenda sorori
fronde levas nimiam caespitibusque famem;
fonte bibis, spectasque tuam stupefacta figuram,
et te ne feriant quae geris arma times;
quaeque modo, ut posses etiam Iove digna videri,
dives eras, nuda nuda recumbis humo.
per mare, per terras cognataque flumina curris;
dat mare, dant amnes, dat tibi terra viam.
quae tibi causa fugae? quid io! freta longa pererras?
non poteris vultus effugere ipsa tuos.
Inachi, quo properas? eadem sequerisque fugisque;
tu tibi dux comiti, tu comes ipsa duci.

80 abest ς; abes *FVWω*
82 pacti *Meurig Davies*; facti *codd.*; sacri *Housman*
inter 82 *et* 83 *lacunam postulavit Scaliger*
85–108 *spurios putaverunt Scaliger et edd. quidam*
86 quo bos ex homine *codd.*; cum bos ex homine *Madvig*; quae bos ex homine *vel* ex quo bos homine *Palmer*
86 ex bove] de bove ς, *Burman*
91 conatoque P^1ς; et conata FP^2Wω
91 queri *FGVW*ς; loqui *P*ς
93 furis *FGPVWω*; fugis ς
93 unda F^2GP^2VWς; umbra P^1ς
98 et te ne *FGPVWω*; et ne te ς
99 posses *F*ς; possis *GPVWω*
103 *et* 106 *spurios putavit*, 104 *et* 105 *inter se commutavit Housman*
103 quid io FGP^2VWω; quid o P^1; quid iam *Riese*; frustra *Palmer*; quid tu *Ehwald*

per septem Nilus portus emissus in aequor
exuit insanae paelicis ora bovis.
ultima quid referam, quorum mihi cana senectus
auctor? dant anni quod querar, ecce, mei!
bella pater patruusque gerunt, regnoque domoque
pellimur, eiectos ultimus orbis habet.
de fratrum populo pars exiguissima restat;
quique dati leto quaeque dedere fleo:
nam mihi quot fratres, totidem periere sorores;
accipiat lacrimas utraque turba meas.
en ego, quod vivis, poenae crucianda reservor
—quid fiet sonti, cum rea laudis agar?—
et consanguineae quondam centesima turbae
infelix uno fratre manente cadam.
at tu, siqua piae, Lynceu, tibi cura sororis,
quaeque tibi tribui munera dignus habes,
adfer opem; vel dedi neci, defunctaque vita
corpora furtivis insuper adde rogis,
et sepeli lacrimis perfusa fidelibus ossa,
sculptaque sint titulo nostra sepulchra brevi:
'exul Hypermestra, pretium pietatis iniquum,
quam mortem fratri depulit, ipsa tulit.'
scribere plura libet; sed pondere lassa catenae
est manus, et vires subtrahit ipse timor.

---

107 per septem Nilus portus (portas ς, *Bentley*) emissus *FGPVW*ω; ostia per septem Nilus demissus *Heinsius*
108 insanae . . . bovis *codd.*; insanae . . . bovi *Heinsius*; insana . . . bove *Heusinger*; insanam . . . bovem *Madvig*
109–110 *spurios putaverunt edd. quidam*
109 referam *codd.*; refero *Heinsius*
109 senectus *codd.*; vetustas *Bentley*
113 [= ille ferox solus solio sceptroque potitur *vel. sim.*] *om.*, 114 *cum* 61 *iungit* P^1? *(eras.) W (post* 118 *locavit)*ς, *Housman*
115 restat *FGPVW*ω; restas ς, *Heinsius*
118 meas] suas ς, *Heinsius*
118 turba *codd.*; *fortasse* turma
120 *parenthesin pupugit Ehwald*
120 fiet *FGPVW*ω; fiat ς; fieret ς
123 Lynceu tibi *Heinsius*; line cur tibi *G*; line et tibi *V*ς; line est tibi *FW*ς; est line tibi ς; est tibi line ς; remanet tibi P^2ς; P^1 *eras.*
125 adfer opem *scripsi*; vel fer opem *codd.*
131–2 *spurios putaverunt* Dilthey *et* Goold.

COMMENTARIES

COMMENTARY ON *HEROIDES* 11, CANACE TO MACAREUS

Synopsis of the myth

The myth of Canace and Macareus is a tragedy of misinformation and miscalculated ruses.

Canace is one of the daughters of Aeolus, identified by Euripides and later authors with Aeolus ruler of the winds. She becomes the lover of one of her brothers, Macareus: there are strong hints in the mythological tradition that Macareus is at best a seducer, at worst a rapist. Making use of state-of-the-art rhetoric, which seems to have provided Euripides' play with one of its chief talking-points (see fragments 16, 18, 19, 27, 28, and F. Verducci (1985) 200ff.), Macareus successfully persuades Aeolus to give each of his daughters (including Canace) in marriage to each of his sons (including Macareus). Canace is already pregnant by Macareus, and she conceals the birth from her father by feigning illness. During the birth of the child, Macareus reassures her, knowing that he has worked his rhetorical spell on Aeolus.

But there is an oversight in Macareus' plan. Aeolus resolves to draw lots to determine which of his daughters will marry which of his sons, and, according to the hypothesis, 'the deviser of this scheme [Macareus] happened to fail in the allocation, because the lot assigned the girl he had seduced to another husband.' To make matters worse, when Canace's well-meaning but interfering nurse attempts a plan of her own, to smuggle the child to safety by concocting a fictitious ritual, Aeolus discovers that his unmarried daughter is a mother, and in a rage at the dishonour sends her a sword with the accompanying message that she knows what must be done (so pseudo-Plutarch and Stobaeus). Macareus approaches his father a second time, explains that the child is his, and earns reprieves for Canace and the child. It is now that Ovid's Canace, determined to carry out her father's will and only dimly aware of the events unfolding around her, writes her letter to Macareus, who is meanwhile rushing to tell her the good news. He arrives too late, and, finding that his betrothed has

committed suicide, follows her example, killing himself with the same sword. The child, it seems, survives both its parents.

An apparently unreconcilable tradition makes Canace bear a child or children to Poseidon (Callimachus, pseudo-Apollodorus, Diodorus).

Sources

Aristophanes *Nubes* 1371–2, and the scholiast there
Calimachus *Hymn* 6.98–9
Diodorus 5.61
Euripides *Aeolus* fr. 14–41 Nauck
Hyginus *Fabulae* 242.2
Ovid *Ibis* 355, *Tristia* 2.384
P. Oxy. 2457 [an incomplete hypothesis for Euripides' *Aeolus*, discovered in 1961. For the text, see Austin pp. 88–9.]
Plato *Laws* 8.838c, and the scholiast there
pseudo-Apollodorus *Bib.* 1.7.4
pseudo-Plutarch *Moralia* 312c [= *Parallel. Min.* 28a]
Stobaeus 4.20.72

LIMC s.v. *Aiolos*, s.v. *Canace*

Ovid's reader would have been expected to be familiar with Euripides' *Aeolus*, which the modern reader must piece together from fragments, later versions of the myth, and an incomplete hypothesis. Pseudo-Plutarch and Stobaeus purport to summarise part of a *Tyrrhenica* by one Sostratus, 'probably the man mentioned by Strabo (14.1.48) as one of the city of Nysa's distinguished scholars' (Knox p. 258; *RE* fixes his date to the first half of the first century B.C.). Two Greek comedies on the myth are also lost: *Aiolosikon*, a late work by Aristpohanes, and Antiphanes' *Aeolus*. Speculation that the myth was the subject of a (lost) major Hellenistic work arises from time to time (see H. Jacobson (1974) 160); but the arguments in support of the theory seem weak; at any rate, the backdrop for Ovid's Canace seems predominantly tragedic and Euripidean rather than Hellenistic (but for possible Hellenistic touches in Ovid's treatment, see my notes on 61 and 85). Cassius Dio (62.10.2) and Suetonius (*Nero* 21.3) thought it worth recording that Nero acted out the rôle of Canace giving birth. Martial wrote an elegy for a young girl, *Aeolidos Canace* (11.91), and Jacobson (1970) 160 muses on 'whether Martial's poem . . . is designed to exploit additional sympathy by the association with the tragic, mythological Canace.' A poem in the Greek Anthology (11.254) addresses an incompetent mime-artist, whose Canace forgets to stab herself before leaving the stage.

1–2:

The couplet is transmitted in the minority tradition. It has been condemned as spurious, with only occasional protests in support of it (H. Dörrie (1960) 210; cf. the apparatus in Dörrie's edition, 'dubito an spurium sit hic distichon'; E.J. Kenney (1970) 196; G. Rosati (1984), a detailed discussion).[1] Arguments on the basis of ms. transmission are inconclusive (see intro.); the lines must be judged on grounds of style and content.

Verses 3–4 (*siqua tamen . . . libellus erit*) cannot form the first couplet. *siqua tamen* would open the epistle with an abruptness that is without purpose: contrast the first couplet of *Her.* 12 (Dörrie's 3–4), which has the angry Medea beginning her letter to Jason mid-reproach. The opening of Seneca *Ep.* 96, *tamen tu indignaris aliquid aut quereris*, cited by H. Jacobson (1974) 167, is insufficiently parallel to be of help to us here: there, *tamen* = 'in spite of everything', and refers to previous correspondance between Seneca and Lucilius. Similarly, Cicero *Fam.* 9.19.1 *tamen a malitia non discedis?*, cited by Knox, refers to previous correspondence between Cicero and Papirius Paetus. Cf. Rosati 419–20. Thus, if one athetizes 1–2, one must either relocate the couplet 3–4 (so G. Luck (1969) 28 and E.A. Kirfel (1969) 73, the former after 6, the latter after 8), or else posit a lacuna before it (so Vahlen (1881), Sedlmayer, Bornecque-Prévost). Alternatively, one might argue that the reader is to imagine the first couplet obscured by a drop of Canace's blood—although that might be too *de trop* even for Ovid, and too gimmicky even for this *novum opus* (on innovation in *Her.*, see intro.).

There is no good reason to suspect 1–2. The couplet is an effective use of epistolary address-formula. Important themes of the epistle are flagged here. The juxtaposed patronymics *Aeolis Aeolidae* introduce (indirectly) the crucial figure of Aeolus (8n.), and also remind the reader that the heroine and her addressee are brother and sister, thus alluding to the 'incest theme' (23–6n.); the motif of the *salus* that the heroine sends with her letter but does not herself possess, connects Canace with two other incestuous letter-writers (*Her.* 4.1–2 Phaedra, *Met.* 9.530–1 Byblis); and *armata verba notata manu* presents Canace's resolve to die, subsequently reframed in 3–4 and 5–6, in

---

[1] Lindemmann does not athetize, but his first line number, 5, appears at Dörrie's 7 (*haec est Aeolidos . . .*).

an epigrammatic manner.[2] See Rosati. Moreover, intertextual play with Propertius 4.3 (3–4n.) is more clearly marked if 1–2 is retained: Arethusa's reference to blots on the page occurs in the second distich of the letter, directly after a couplet naming writer and addressee; so too does Canace's.[3] And *Aeolis Aeolidae* might perhaps be an 'Alexandrian footnote',[4] signalling to the reader an important intertext for the epistle—Euripides' *Aeolus* (see intro).

3–4:

Engagement with an intertext heightens the suspense and the sense of impending tragedy. Arethusa apologizes for the illegibility of her letter at Propertius 4.3.3–6:

> si qua tamen tibi lecturo pars oblita derit,
> haec erit e lacrimis facta litura meis:
> aut si qua incerto fallet te littera tractu,
> signa meae dextrae iam morientis erunt.

Propertius 4.3 is an obvious intertext for the *Heroides* (see intro.), and allusion to these lines is flagged by verbal markers (*siqua tamen, oblitus, lituris, dextra*). Canace's deviations from Arethusa are telling. The blots on Arethusa's page will be caused by tears (cf. also *Her.* 3.3, 15.98) and a moribund hand. The expectation that the blots in Canace's case will have a similar cause is shattered by *caede* (confirmed by 5 *ferrum*; both are in emphatic position). The cause of any illegible smudges will be her own blood; *caede* here = 'blood' (*OLD* s.v. *caedes* 4), not (so e.g. Knox) 'death'; cf. F. Verducci (1985) 209 '. . . *caedes*, the bright jet of blood from the dutifully inevitable wound.' *caecis* ('illegible'; see Knox) and *caede* perhaps give a grim etymological jingle (cf. the Propertian jingle *litura . . . littera*). *errabunt* denotes not shaky handwriting like Arethusa's (Propertius 5–6), but the effect of blood

---

[2] The phrase *armata verba notata manu* does not, to be sure, stand too close scrutiny—is she holding the sword and the pen in the same hand? but that very fact, *pace* Jacobson (1974) 166–7, makes it unlikely to be the work of an interpolator, or at any rate of a literal-minded one.

[3] For Ovid's skill at locating allusions in the same line of his poem as of the poem alluded to, compare *Am.* 2.11 with Propertius 1.8: in both, the girl is named in the eighth line, Ceraunia in the nineteenth, and hostile winds are discussed in 9–10.

[4] The term is used in this commentary for any word or phrase that signposts an intertext (13.3n., 23–4n., 135ff.n., 14.73–8n.; and cf. 13.12–4 on a possible 'footnote' glossing a feature of prosody). For a discussion on the phenomenon, see S. Hinds (1998) 1ff.

on fresh ink. If Canace's letter bears physical marks of distress, they will be more extreme than tears. She is resolved to commit suicide (cf. e.g. 99–100, 130); and the reader familiar with the myth expects her to carry this out (see intro.).

4 dominae:
Ovid appears to have been responsible for extending the usage of *dominus/a* to describe (**a**) a character's relationship with part of his body (cf. 14.60; *TLL* s.v. *domina* 1919.15ff. and s.v. *dominus* 1936.48ff.); (**b**) with his post-metamorphosis self (*TLL* s.v. *dominus* 1936.52ff.; cf. *Met.* 10.502 *nomen erile*, a conflation of (**a**) and (**b**)); and (**c**), as here, to denote the relationship between an author and his work (see Knox). Pre-Ovidian instances of *dominus/a* so used (e.g. Catullus 66.75–6, of Berenice and her lock of hair), occur in the context of a broader personification. Martial in particular appropriated the technique for himself: note e.g. 12.59.8 *menti dominus periculosi*, of a man with a contagious skin disease.

4–6 libellus . . . calamum . . . charta:
Canace's scene-setting to her letter provides us with the most explicit reference to the act of writing in the *Heroides*. She composes her epistle with a *calamus* (= a reed-pen, *OLD* s.v. *calamus* 2) on *charta* (= papyrus, *OLD* s.v. *charta* 2) and, judging by rare references elsewhere, so do her fellow heroines (1.62 *charta*; mention of tear-blots at 3.3 and 15.98 are more suggestive of papyrus than of wax). A pedant might regard this as an anachronism.[5] Lovers in the *Amores*, *Ars Amatoria* and *Metamorphoses* compose letters to the beloved on wax-tablets (*Am.* 1.11.7, 15, 24 and 25; 1.12.1 and 7; 2.5.5; 2.15.15; 2.19.41; 3.14.31; *Ars* 1.383 and 437; 2.395 and 543; 3.469, 485, 496, 621 and 630; *Met.* 9.523, 571, 575, 587 and 604; 14.707) and one might have expected Ovid's heroines to follow suit. Their choice may reflect the arduous journey that most of these missives would have to take to reach their addressee (wax tablets are less suitable for long distances); but it may also be a playful nod to Ovid's reader,

[5] N. Lewis (1974) 86 believes that 'it is not possible on present evidence to fix the time when the Greek world began to write on papyrus', but considers 'reasonable' D.L. Page's opinion (Page (1964) 120) that 'it is very unlikely that papyrus was in common use in the lifetime of Archilochus [fl. seventh century B.C.] or indeed for a generation or two before him'.

who is permitted to imagine that the *libellus* in his or her possession is the *libellus* upon which the heroine wrote. This makes the stylistic presence of Ovid in the text all the more amusing.

5 calamum . . . ferrum:
The internal rhyme between two nouns contrasts the peaceable contents of Canace's right hand with the weapon held in her left.

6:
The pose is that of an ancient scribe, unrolled papyrus in lap (cf. Knox). There is, however, something erotic in the description (*iacet*, J.N. Adams (1982) 177; *gremio*, op. cit. 92; *soluta*, cf. 13.114 *solvar*) which suits the elegiac content of the letter.

7 Aeolidos:
Aeolis as a substantive meaning 'daughter of Aeolus' occurs in Latin literature only in Ovid, of Canace here and at verse 34, and of Alcyone at *Met.* 11.444 and 573; in Greek, see Parthenius *Erotika* 2.2, cited by Knox. Martial 11.91 is an epitaph for a young girl, identified in line 1 as *Aeolidos Canace*: the phrase is almost universally taken to mean 'Canace daughter of Aeolus'; see N.M. Kay (1985) on the names, and F.A. Paley – W.H. Stone (1905) for an alternative interpretation.

imago:
imago introduces a subtle but striking metaphor that is sustained during the following three lines. On the level of this metaphor, Canace becomes a work of art—a figure on the stage or, more likely, a painting or sculpture—one which, she states with irony, is likely to delight (*OLD* s.v. *placere* 1e '(of public performers, shows or sim.) to find favour with an audience of spectators') Aeolus, the artist himself (*OLD* s.v. *auctor* 13b), who will not be present as a *spectator* (9) when the final touches (10 *exigeretur*; the word is often used of perfecting works of art, e.g. *Met.* 15.871) are put to his own work of art (*OLD* s.v. *opus* 9b).

It is interesting that Canace appears to have provided painters with subject-matter for their art: there survives a Lucanian pot of the early fifth century B.C. (*LIMC* s.v. *Aiolos* 1), on which the (presumably dead) heroine is depicted reclining on a couch, a dagger held in the hand that hangs down towards the ground; see too *LIMC*

s.v. *Kanake* 3, an A.D. third century fresco depicting Canace, sword in hand. While it is unlikely that there ever existed a representation of Canace in the pose described by Ovid here, the poet's choice of metaphor may well have been inspired by a particular work of art, or at least by artistic depictions of Canace in general.

8 duro . . . patri:
The *durus pater* was the bane of the elegiac lover (see e.g. *Rem.* 563–4 *cui durus pater est, ut voto cetera cedant, huic pater ante oculos durus habendus erit*, advice to the lover eager to forget his beloved); he had, however, earlier been one of the stock features of comedy (see e.g. *Am.* 1.15.17–8, with J.C. McKeown (1989) *ad loc.*; R.L. Hunter (1985) 95ff.). 'Typically the father earned the epithet *durus* for trying to obstruct the love-life of his children: the case of Canace is a bit extreme' (Knox). The young Canace, in whose world Aeolus looms large, can only think to obey (*placere*) him, however *durus* he may be, and whatever the consequences of her obedience. But that does not prevent her from childishly grumbling about his character behind his back in the lines that follow.

9–10:
The allusion to Virgil *Aen.* 10.443 [Turnus speaks] . . . *cuperem ipse parens spectator adesset* suggests that Canace will indeed go through with her suicide, just as Turnus succeeded in murdering Pallas; and it draws attention to the cruel character of Aeolus: while Pallas' father Evander is absent from his son's murder at the hands of another, Canace's, though absent, is represented as responsible for his daughter's death. In addition, the context imparts to Canace's lines dramatic irony: G. Williams (1992) convincingly argues that, as Canace writes, Aeolus is unable to fulfill his daughter's summons precisely because he is in conversation with Macareus, who successfully persuades him to grant her a pardon (cf. intro.). This couplet reminds the reader familiar with the myth that, in committing suicide, Canace will in fact be going against the will of the one whom she feels compelled to obey.

10 oculis exigeretur:
oculis is probably dative, '. . . the work were accomplished for the eyes . . .'. Knox prefers to interpret '. . . the work were examined by the eyes . . .'.

11 at:

The paradosis *ut* is printed by most editors. The usage (= *OLD* s.v. *ut* 21 '(causal) as may (might) be expected from the fact that, inasmuch as') is prosaic, but used on occasion by Ovid; cf. Knox. However, the train of thought here requires that 11–2 form a contrast with, and remodification of, 9–10: 'I would like him to witness my death:—yet he is heartless, and would not shed a tear'. Line 11, then, cries out for an adversative particle to signpost its relationship with what precedes. Preferable is *at*, which Dörrie recorded as the reading of a single ms., and was preferred by Riese, pref. 14. Cf. *Am.* 2.1.33, whose context similarly demands *at* rather than the *ut* printed by Ehwald and given by certain mss. That in our line the correct reading occurs in only one of Dörrie's mss. should worry us little: *at*)(*ut* is a simple corruption, particularly at line beginning (M.L. West (1973) 26 includes *a* and *u* among commonly confused letters in miniscule script).

multoque suis truculentior euris:

For characters being compared with something associated with them, cf. Achilles at *Her.* 3.133 *sis licet inmitis matrisque ferocior undis* and Amor at *Am.* 2.9.49 *tu levis es multoque tuis ventosior alis*. The similarity between this latter example and our line is striking, and may have further significance. *ventosus*, which may mean both 'swift as the wind' and 'fickle' (*OLD* q.v. 4 and 5 respectively), is a good translation of the Greek word αἰόλος, from which Canace's father takes his name ('The Swift', 'The Changeable'). Provided Ovid's reader can be expected to spot the allusion, it may not be fanciful to regard Canace's substitution of *ventosior* with *truculentior* (though the latter word is chosen to suit her argument) as telling. The allusion may point to an aspect of Aeolus' character that Canace has overlooked: his changeability (Williams (1992) 208–9). As the heroine writes, her father is changing his mind about her death (9–10n.).

suis . . . euris:

The distinction between Aeolus ruler of the winds (Homer's Αἴολος Ἱπποτάδης, *Od.* 10.2) and Aeolus, son of Hellen, father of Canace et al. (Hesiod's Αἴολος ἱππιοχάρμης, *Catalogue* fr. 9 Merkelbach-West) seems to have been cast aside in Euripides' lost *Aeolus*: the eponymous character was both the son of Hellen (fr. 14 Ἕλλην γάρ, ὡς λέγουσι, γίγνεται Διός,/τοῦ δ' Αἴολος παῖς) and, if we may judge from

the hypothesis (P. Oxy. 2457.21), lord of the winds (Αἴολος παρὰ θεῶν ἔχων τὴν τῶν ἀνέμων δεσποτεί-/αν). See Jacobson (1974) 164, Knox in his intro. to this epistle. Whether Euripides took advantage of this two-fold Aeolus as Ovid does here and below, by involving him in an unflattering comparison with his winds, is unknown.

truculentior:
For the comparative elsewhere in Ovid, cf. *Met.* 13.803 and *Pont.* 2.7.31. The word is appropriate here since it may apply not only to men but also to natural elements (*OLD* s.v. *truculentus* b); cf. Knox. *crudelior*, read by two mss., and *violentior*, the reading of three, are likely to be scribal glosses which at some point supplanted the correct reading in the text.

12 spectaret:
spectaret picks up 9 *spectator*. The majority reading is *spectasset* (P has the garbled *spectat sed*); but after *adesset* (9) and *exigeretur* (10), an imperfect subjunctive expressing an impossible situation in the present is expected. I remain unconvinced by Jacobson's assertion that '. . . the choice (sc. of the past tense) is precise and deliberate. We are presented with a Canace who is already dead, or at any rate offering an image of herself as already dead' (Jacobson (1974) 172; cf. Knox, 'the tense of the verb is "epistolary"; that is, from the point of view of the recipient Canace is already "dead"'). The lapse into remote pluperfect tense is unexpected and unexplained. Far more likely is that *spectasset* is a corruption of *spectaret*, which is read by six of Dörrie's mss. and given by one other as a *varia lectio.*

13 saevis vivere ventis:
The alliteration may serve to imitate the sound of the winds (cf. 13.129n.).

15–6:
The list of winds (South, West, North and East) under Aeolus' rule is a fine display of Ovidian *variatio* and a playful combination of Greek and Roman elements. *Sithonius* = Thracian, and therefore Northern from a Greek perspective (cf. Knox *ad loc.* and on 2.6); but Canace is not a Greek (the family lives on the islands off Etruria, according to the hypothesis to Euripides *Aeolus*; and Virgil's Aeolia, home of Aeolus, is identified with Lipara), and the epithet therefore

draws attention to itself. Similarly, the fifth foot hiatus and final tetrasyllable of 15 are graecizing features (see e.g. S.J. Harrison (1991) on Virgil *Aen.* 10.136; cf. Knox), but 'Ovid cleverly employs [them] with the only wind that does not receive its Greek name [*Aquilo*]' (Knox).

On elision at a third foot strong caesura (*-que et*...), see M. Platnauer *LEV* 84 heading 7; he counted 24 examples in Ovid's elegiacs.

16 pinnis, Eure . . . tuis:

The image of the winged winds was a favourite one with Ovid, whether as part of a larger personification (so at *Met.* 1.264 and 6.707) or as an isolated poetic detail (so at *Trist.* 3.10.45 and *Ibis* 199). Before our poet, references to the winds' winged plumage are scarce: Cicero may have referred to the wings of the North Wind (*Aquilonis alis*) at *Arat.* 33.13 *horrisonis Aquilonis . . . alis.*[6] The motif had its roots in Greek art: e.g. Eurus is one of eight winds, all complete with wings, on the Tower of the Winds in Athens (*LIMC* s.v. *Venti* 12). By means of a sustained personification (cf. 14 *ingenio populi* and the apostrophe *Eure proterve*), Canace characterizes the winds as Aeolus' subjects. There need be no significance in the singling-out of Eurus here (so Knox); but the verse may engage with Virgil *Aen.* 1.317 *volucremque fuga praevertitur Eurum* (*Eurum* a conjecture for the paradosis *Hebrum*).

17 ventis; tumidae . . . irae:

tumidus may describe both wind (*OLD* s.v. 1b) and rage (*OLD* s.v. 4). J. Dryden (1680) captured the pun in his rather free translation: 'Those he can rule; but his Tempestuous Mind/Is, like his airy Kingdom, unconfin'd.'

non imperat irae:

Canace's indictment of her father plays off against the Virgilian picture of Aeolus moderating the passions of the winds, *Aen.* 1.56–7 *celsa sedet Aeolus arce/sceptra tenens mollitque animos et temperat iras.* Cf. Jacobson (1974) 165. Canace subverts Virgil's depiction of Aeolus as a just ruler, and (see 18n. *vitiis regna minora suis*) directs the reader's attention to a more unfavourable representation of him.

---

[6] When in the *de Natura Deorum* Balbus quotes from '*carminibus Arateis . . . a te* [i.e. Cicero] *admodum adulescentulo conversa*' (2.104) all mss. give *auris* (2.111).

18 possid<u>et</u> <u>et</u>:
The postponement of *et* to second place in the clause, not uncommon in elegy, here produces the sort of jingle to which both Servius and Quintilian took exception:

> mala est compositio ab ea syllaba incipere qua superior finitus est sermo; nam plerumque et cacenphaton facit.
> (Servius on Virgil *Aen.* 2.27)

> videndum etiam ne syllaba verbi prioris ultima et prima sequentis +idē nec+ [idem sonet = Watt on Cicero *Ep.* fr. 7.13]
> (Quintilian *Inst.* 9.4.41).

The frequent occurrence of such sound-play among the Latin poets, often employed, as here, to no obvious end, demonstrates that they, at least, did not share the grammarians' view. N.I. Herescu (1948) gives a large range of examples. Cf. 13.73, 13.99, 14.73.

vitiis regna minora suis:
A provocative phrase: was Aeolus' kingdom so very large? The answer, according to Virgil's Neptune, is affirmative: *tenet ille immania saxa,/vestras, Eure, domos* (*Aen.* 1.139–40). Given the allusion to *Aen.* 1.57 in the preceding line, and the signpost *pinnis, Eure proterve, tuis* (cf. Virgil's *vestras, Eure, domos*) in 16, the reader might be expected to identify *Aen.* 1.139 as the line that informs this one. Familiarity with *Aen.* 1.139 is not required to understand Canace's insult, but will give an added dimension to it. Neptune paints an unfavourable picture of the lord of the winds: see R.G. Austin (1971) on *Aen.* 139 for the implications of *immania.* By referring to 'kingdoms smaller than his own faults', Canace simultaneously refers to and betters Neptune's slur.

19–20:
Canace's assertion of her ancestry is unheralded by anything, save a general tone of indignation, in her preceding train of thought; nobility, however, seems to have been a predominant theme of Euripides' play (note esp. fr. 22 Nauck τὴν δ' εὐγένειαν πρὸς θεῶν μή μοι λέγε,/ἐν χρήμασιν τόδ' ἐστί, μὴ γαυροῦ, πάτερ . . .; cf. also 14, 15, 16, 20, 21), and it is not inconceivable that lines 17–8 would have directed the reader familiar with the *Aeolus,* as we are not, to a Euripidean passage that contained a reference to Canace's noble family.

The tradition followed by Euripides in the *Aeolus* (fr. 14 Nauck) assigns Canace the following ancestry:

Zeus→Hellen→Aeolus→Canace.

It is to this tradition that Ovid's Canace would seem to refer. But if she wished to state that she was the great-granddaughter of Jupiter, she might have found a less roundabout way than this couplet: the plural phrase *avorum nomina* in particular is strange if only one *avi nomen* (i.e. Hellen) stands between the heroine and the father of the gods.

Elsewhere in Ovid, Aeolus ruler of the winds is the son not of Hellen but of Hippotes, both at *Her.* 18.46, and at *Met.* 4.663 where he is the father of Canace's sister Alcyone. A further complication arises in the form of a third tradition whereby Hellen is the son not of Zeus but either of Prometheus (Schol. Pindar *Olympians* 9.68) or of Prometheus' son Deucalion (Thucydides 1.3.2). Moreover, there is a tradition that makes Canace the mother of a child or children by Poseidon (pseudo-Apollodorus *Bib.* 1.7.4; Callimachus *Hymn* 6.98–9, with N. Hopkinson (1984) 30–1), and thus, in effect, Jupiter's sister-in-law. In the light of these alternative traditions, Ovid's Canace might be forgiven for framing her assertion in a rather vague manner. Cf. Knox on 'genealogical gerrymandering'.

21–2:

The alliteration of *f* picks out the key words: the sword (*ferrum*), its deadly characteristics (*infestum, funebria*) and the opposing quality (*femina*) of the hand that holds it. In addition, the reader may detect a shudder of fear on Canace's part as she discusses the instrument of her impending suicide (see Quintilian *Inst.* 12.10.29 on the almost inhuman shuddering sound of the letter *f*).

21 num:

So all editors, rightly. Heinsius here cites examples of *num minus* to support *num* over the *non* read by several of Dörrie's mss. In fact, his citations are unhelpful: in all but two cases the mss. offer *non* as well as *num*, and, as here, sense does not preclude either. Moreover, the two exceptions work against, not for, Heinsius' argument: at *Trist.* 1.2.74[7] and 2.106 no edition ascribes *num* to even a single ms.

[7] But some editors (e.g. Owen and Hall in their respective OCT's) print *num minus* in the text.

The manuscripts can offer no help; *non* and *num* are readily confused, especially in abbreviated form (e.g. *n'* might stand for either: see W.M. Lindsay (1915) 143 and 358ff.). One must rely on judgement. The repetition of *non* (***non*** *minus* . . . ***non*** *mea tela*) would be clumsy and to no good effect. *num*, if correct, would contribute to alliteration in the line (for *um* and *mu* sounds mimicking lament, cf. e.g. Catullus 64.223). Print *num*, but be sure to take the distich closely with what precedes: Dryden's translation, 'What help will all my Heav'nly Friends afford/When to my Breast I lift the pointed Sword?', (Dryden (1680)), though hardly faithful to the original, is, however, more accurate than Isbell's 'Is this steel—my funeral gift—less deadly because it is in a woman's hand?' (H. Isbell (1990)).

funebria munera:
= 'a fatal gift'; the phrase is a parenthetical development of *infestum* (*OLD* s.v. *infestus* 3c '(of weapons or sim.) poised to strike, raised threateningly'); on the mannered word-order *infestum, funebria munera, ferrum*, see J.B. Solodow (1986), who terms it 'inserted apposition', and Knox on 7.158. Given, however, the primary meaning of *funebris* (*OLD* q.v. 1 'of or connected with a funeral, funerary, funereal') and a common usage of *munus* (*OLD* q.v. 3 'something given as a duty, a tribute, offering (to deities, the dead, etc.)'; cf. *TLL* q.v. 1666.70ff.), one detects an undertone: the sword is Aeolus' funeral gift to his daughter, but one given before, not after, her death, and to be its cause rather than its propitiation.

22 non mea tela:
'Not my equipment'; swords are not suitable for women's hands. A pun may suggest what is suitable: wool-work, symbolized by the *tela* (cf. Bornecque-Prévost, Knox; and see further 14.65n.). The phrase may contain a second pun: the sword is literally *non mea tela*, because it belongs not to Canace but to her father (97).

23–6:
The incestuous heroine touches upon the incestuousness of her relationship only here (cf. Verducci (1985) 210). Incest is of little concern to the protagonists: Aeolus' rage flares up on discovering the child which (81f.) he knows to be Canace's; he does not know that the child is also Macareus'. Aeolus sends the sword to Canace not

because of incest, but because of the loss of her honour, a loss which the existence of the child irrefutably demonstrates; his reaction is a predictable one (cf. the words of Europa's father to his seduced daughter at Horace *Carm.* 3.27.58 *quid mori cessas?*). His motivation appears to have been the same in other versions of the myth: according to the reconstruction by Williams (1992) of the broad outline of the story prior to Ovid, Aeolus agreed to marry his daughters to his sons before the sword was sent to Canace; this suggests an Aeolus less concerned with incest than with the fact that his unmarried daughter had given birth. Contrast Verducci's view that Ovid suppresses all suggestions of a 'permissive context' that sanctions an incestuous relationship ('The suppression of Aeolus' motivation, of the drawing of lots, and of the other consanguineous marriages is essential to Ovid's portrait of Canace', 221). Canace's rhetorical question at 25–6 stems not from moral reflection, but from practicalities: that 23–6 follows a couplet which reflects upon the sword and impending death is significant. To Canace, no love-affair with Macareus would have meant no illegitimate child, and hence no impending punishment. 25–6 do nevertheless contain some suggestion that her love for Macareus might have been in some way unnatural (*plus . . . quam frater, non debet*): she does not know why her father is angry, and may have a vague notion that he objects to incest, unaware that he has in fact already agreed to marry his sons to his daughters, and is angry not because he knows the true identity of the baby's father, but because he does not know (cf. intro.).

For Ovid's reader, however, incest is an inescapable theme of the myth, and 25–6 will mark out Canace as an incestuous heroine (cf. *Ars* 1.285 *Myrrha patrem, sed non qua filia debet, amavit*, and *Met.* 9.456 *non soror ut fratrem, nec qua debebet, amabat* [sc. Byblis], both cited by Knox). The incest theme seems to have been present e.g. in Euripides' *Aeolus*: fr. 17 Nauck ἆρ' ἔτυμον φάτιν ἔγνων,/Αἴολε, σ' εὐνάζειν τέκνα φίλτατα; and perhaps also 24 κακὸν γυναῖκα πρὸς νέαν ζεῦξαι νέον·/μακρὰ γὰρ ἰσχὺς μᾶλλον ἀρσένων μένει,/θήλεια δ' ἥβη θᾶσσον ἐκλείπει δέμας indicate that incest was a 'theme' of the play. Note too the inclusion of Canace in a fresco depicting female victims of illicit love (*LIMC* s.v. *Kanake* 3). *Her.* 11 has always been regarded as an 'incest-poem'; as such, it is omitted from his edition by Shuckburgh, 'not as being inferior . . . but because its subject is such as to make its absence at any rate no matter of regret in a book intended

primarily for Schools' (intro. p. 24). The 'incest theme' is signalled to the reader in the first couplet of the epistle (1–2n.).

23 commisit in unum:
'Only once does [Canace] allude to their sexual liaison (23–6), and this in terms which almost completely lack physical colors' (Jacobson (1974) 168). The tone of *commisit in unum* is not readily apparent; the only other instance of the phrase, *Met.* 4.579–80 *commissaque in unum/paulatim tereti tenuantur acumine crura*, of the transformation of Cadmus' legs into a serpent's tail, is of little help in determining it. Nevertheless, it seems likely that Canace, in describing her union with Macareus, has chosen a phrase more physical in tone than Jacobson gives her credit for. See F. Bömer (1969–1986) on *Met.* 4.579 for examples of *committere* = 'join/fuse together'. More telling are Columella 6.37.9 *nec tamen temere feminae committetur*, of the mating of stallions with mares, and *Act. Petr.* 33 *[concubinae] paratae erant om<nia> mala pati, quam se committere cum eo* (cited at *TLL* s.v. *committo* 1903.60–2); see also *Met.* 4.369–70 *illa premit commissaque corpore toto/sicut inhaerebat*, where *committere* carries both a sexual and, in anticipation of the fusing together of Hermaphroditus and Salmacis, more literal sense. Compare the use of *admittere* as 'the technical term for the bringing of one animal to the other' (Adams (1982) 206). For *in unum* with sexual reference, see *Fast.* 3.683 *'coeamus in unum'*, Lucretius 5.1012 *concessit in unum* (followed by a lacuna). Canace's phrase is probably an openly sexual one, or at the very least has strong sexual undertones; cf. Knox. Note that the phrasing assigns an active role to the *hora*, and passes no judgement on the willingness or otherwise of the two sexual partners: that is implicit in the lines that follow.

24 leto serior . . . meo:
i.e. *numquam.* For the moribund Canace, death is a natural reference-point.

25:
Hexameters consisting of spondees in all but the fifth foot are sufficiently uncommon in the *Heroides* to warrant attention: in the single letters, cf. only 2.75, 77, 99, 3.89, 115, 5.43, 45, 6.131, 7.49, 9.9, 109, 10.39, 83, 117, 14.107. In each case, the metre seems to work towards a particular effect. At both 7.49 and 14.107 it describes

waterflow, in a calm sea and through the mouths of the Nile respectively. Elsewhere it serves to draw attention to a particularly emotive line. At 10.83 Ariadne fears for her safety; other spondaic lines contain some rebuke towards the addressee. Spondees and alliteration of *q* at 3.115 emphasize Briseis' indignation that, as she sees it, another mistress is keeping Achilles back from the fighting; and at 6.131 the heavy metre underlines Hypsipyle's incredulous anger that Jason has come under the spell of such a woman as Medea.

Here too the metre hammers out a rebuke, as Canace upbraids Macareus for his incestuous passion.

cur umquam:
Cf. 12.9 and 11; *Trist* 5.1.20; Horace *S.* 1.5.68. For this use of *umquam* see *OLD* s.v. *umquam* 2 '(with reduced temporal force, in cls. emphasizing the fact of an occurrence) Ever, at all'.

27:
Canace asserts that she was a willing participant in her affair with her brother. However, she also offers hints that Macareus was at the very least the prime mover, and perhaps even violent in his pursuit of her: cf. 39n. *vitiati*, 59–64n.; Knox on our line, '*quoque* does suggest that it was Macareus who took the initiative'. Ovid filters the details of the myth, which include in some versions suggestions that Macareus raped Canace (pseudo-Plutarch *Moralia* 312c = *Parallel. Min.* 28a ἔφθειρε, Schol. Aristophanes *Nub.* 1371 φθείροντα, and the hypothesis to Euripides *Aeolus* διεφθειρεν all denote Macareus taking the initiative; Stobaeus 4.20.72 ἐβιάσατο denotes rape),[8] through the mind of Canace herself. Thus the reader perceives Canace as a novice in matters of love (cf. e.g. 28n., 29–34n.), who was seduced by a forceful approach from her brother. But Canace's naïveté has a tragic dimension: she is unaware that the passionate Macareus has secured a repreive from Aeolus (see intro.).

28 nescioquem . . . deum:
Cupid, patron deity of the elegiac lover, is to Canace 'some god or other'. The phrase reveals not only her minimal experience of love

[8] The accounts of pseudo-Plutarch and Stobaeus pupport to summarize part of the *Tyrrhenica* of Sostratus: for a possible identification of this Sostratus, see e.g. Knox in his intro. to our epistle.

(cf. 27 *qualemque audire solebam*: she has heard lovers talking of love, or perhaps listened to a recitation of elegy), but also her bitterness: this god has brought her to her death. *nescioquem* should be printed as a single word: cf. 13.91n.

corde tepente:
'Hor. Carm. 1.4.19–20 *quo calet iuventus/nunc omnis et mox virgines tepebunt*, where there is a contrast between *tepere* and *calere*, which does not seem intended here' (Palmer). He glosses over the crucial point: *tepente* is entirely the wrong word to describe the heart of one who is burning (27 *incalui*) with love. R.G.M. Nisbet – M. Hubbard (1970) on *Carm.* 1.4.20 cite Statius *Silv.* 1.2.139f.: both these instances, while they refer to a presence rather than an absence of love, describe a hesitant and gradual onset; this is not in keeping with the context of our passage (contrast Knox, '*tepere* is less strong than *calere*, and thus more appropriate for the first stirrings of passion'). Ovid employs *tepeo* in an erotic context twice (*Am.* 2.2.53, *Rem.* 7); in both cases, it takes the sense 'To be lukewarm in one's feelings' (*OLD* s.v. *tepeo* 3b) and is contrasted with *amo*. As 29ff. demonstrate, Canace presents with the classic symptoms of love, among which is a heart that is, not 'tepid', but 'trembling' (e.g. Sappho 31.5–6 τό μ' ἦ μὰν/καρδίαν ἐν στήθεσιν ἐπτόαισεν). Print *tremente*, the reading of four of Dörrie's mss., and cf. 5.68 for *corde tremente* in this *sedes*. After 27 *incalui*, 'warmth' may have been on the scribe's mind, making the corruption particularly easy.

29–34:
The classic symptoms of elegiac love are to Canace, love's raw recruit, unfamiliar sensations: this fact may explain the unusual phrasing of these familiar motifs (see following nn.). However, her professed amatory naïveté is in amusing tension with the highly rhetorical phrasing of her list: the lines consist of a pair of ascending *tricola*; in each, the first *colon* ends with the caesura, the second takes up the remainder of the hexameter, and the third occupies the pentameter; variation is achieved by having asyndeton in the first *tricolon* and connectives in the second. Canace presents herself as having been a normal lover in all respects save in that she could not recognize her own condition. She does not here characterize her feelings towards her brother as incestuous (cf. 23–6n.). Contrast Ovid's Byblis who, in her letter to the brother with whom she is in love, concludes a similar list of

symptoms with *et crebri amplexus et quae, si forte notasti,/oscula sentiri non esse sororia possent* (*Met.* 9.538–9).

29:
The catalogue begins with the two most familiar physical signs of the lover: pallor and thinness. See e.g. *Ars* 1.729 *palleat omnis amans* and 733 *arguat et macies animum*, with A.S. Hollis (1977) on each.

adduxerat:
adducere occurs in a similarly physiological context at *Met.* 3.397 *adducitque cutem macies* of Echo, lovesick and, quite literally, fading-away; at Virgil *Georg.* 3.483 *sitis miseros adduxerat artus*, of animals inflicted with a plague; at Lucan 4.287–8 *ossaque nondum adduxere cutem* of a freshly-wounded man; and at Gellius 16.3.3 . . . *tunc loco, in quem cibus capitur, vel stipato vel adducto voluntas capiendi eius desiderandique restringitur*, of a patient's gut.

While the general sense of the verb thus applied is clear (*OLD* s.v. *adduco* 12 'to cause to shrink, draw together, contract'), the particular meaning in each case is not readily apparent. Where *cutem* is the object, one should perhaps translate 'form into wrinkles' (thus *Met.* 3.397 appears to refer to the puckering of skin once the flesh has wasted away. Lucan 4.288 is more difficult; the explanation given by A.E. Housman (1926) is not entirely satisfactory). Cf. *adducere* of creasing the brow into a frown (*OLD* s.v. *adduco* 12b, and s.v. *adductus* 1b).

Georg. 3.483 is a close parallel for our line; it seems likely that Ovid's *adduxerat artus* alludes to Virgil's *adduxerat artus.* In both cases, translate 'had withered the frame'. Planudes gives κατέστειλε, which is, like *adducere*, a verb appropriate for medical contexts (cf. Dioscorides *De Materia Medica* 2.1, of reducing a swelling). In our line and in *Georg.*, the mss. offer variants for *adduxerat* (*abduxerat, obduxerat, reduxerat* here; *attraxerat* there); they are most likely scribal reactions to an unfamiliar phrase.

30 coacta:
V. Loers (1825) and Palmer rightly contested Burman's paraphrase 'contracta, minora per maciem et aegritudinem facta'. The point is not that Canace is physically unable to eat but that, like the homesick poet himself at *Trist.* 3.8.28 *nec iuvat ora cibus*, she is off her food. *coacta* works with *minimos* to highlight the extent to which she has

lost her appetite: her mouth is willing to accept only the smallest amount of food (*minimos . . . cibos*; the plural may suggest food taken little and often, as befits an invalid: see Palmer here and at 20.134 (132 his numbering), but contrast Kenney on the latter), and even that only when under compulsion. The Latin does not specify who does the compelling. It is perhaps Canace's nurse or, more likely, Canace herself: i.e. eating requires an effort of self-will, like the tears at *Am.* 1.8.83 *discant oculi lacrimare coacti* (cited by Loers) and at *Met.* 6.628 *invitique oculi lacrimis maduere coactis.*

31:
For the lover as insomniac, see e.g *Am.* 1.2.1–4 with McKeown (1989) *ad loc.*

somni:
Austin (1964) on Virgil *Aen.* 2.9 argues convincingly that that poet's use of the singular and plural forms of *somnus* is not constrained by metre, but rather reflects particular nuances of meaning: besides the phrase *in somnis* = 'in one's sleep (usu. with reference to dreams)' (*OLD* s.v. *somnus* 1c), the plural is chosen, according to Austin, 'if "sleep" is a means of comfort or enjoyment.'

To what extent Ovid made a similar distinction between the singular and the plural of *somnus* is difficult to judge. Consider *Am.* 2.9.39–41:

> infelix, tota quicumque quiescere nocte
>   sustinet et somnos praemia magna vocat.
> stulte, quid est somnus gelidae nisi mortis imago?

The man who deems sleep a boon designates it with the plural *somnos*; the lover, to whom it is *gelidae . . . mortis imago*, employs the singular *somnus.* This is in accord with the Virgilian usage; elsewhere, however, the 'rule' is broken. See e.g. *Met.* 2.779 *nec fruitur somno vigilacibus excita curis* and 6.489 *hinc placido dantur sua corpora somno*; in both cases, the boon of sleep is designated not by the plural, but by the singular *somno.* Palmer thought that the plural at *Her.* 20.134 (132 his numbering) suggested 'the short sleeps taken during the day as well as in the night.' One should therefore not be too ready to ascribe the plural *somni* here to Canace's wistful longing for the tranquil (*faciles*) sleep that she lacks. Cf. *OLD* s.v. *somnus* 1, 'Sleep; (in pl. not usually distinguishable in sense from sg.)'; and Kenney's more

uncategorical judgement, '*somnus* is used indifferently in sing. and pl.' (Kenney on 20.134, 132 his numbering). Cf. 13.109n., 14.72n.

faciles:
Used of sleep on only two other occassions: of the easy sleep enjoyed by the young at Horace *Carm.* 2.11.8, and of that brought about by a fine wine at *Carm.* 3.21.4. In either case the singular of *somnus* is used: Horace, then, does not rigidly adhere to Austin's Virgilian rule (see previous n.).

nox erat annua nobis:
The night is endless for the lonely lover (e.g. McKeown (1989) on *Am.* 1.2.3 4; by contrast, a night spent with the beloved passes all too quickly, as at e.g. *Am.* 1.13, Propertius 3.20.14). The manner in which Canace frames this *topos* (to her, the night seems a year long) is effective and original.

32:
Canace groans with no apparent reason: cf. Byblis at *Met.* 9.537 (but Byblis, unlike Canace, herself knows the true cause). The epistle contains two negations of the '*dolor* produces *gemitus*' motif (a favourite of Ovid's; see e.g. *Met.* 2.486 *adsiduoque suos gemitu testata dolores* of the newly-transformed Callisto and 11.708–9 *plura dolor prohibet . . . et attonito gemitus a corde trahuntur* of the grief-stricken Alcyone). Here, the *gemitus* occurs without *dolor*, while at 53–4 the situation is reversed: the *gemitus* demanded by *dolor* are repressed.

34:
The heroine's near-paradoxical predicament is summarised in a single pentameter. Pentameters with sense-pauses at a weak caesura in the third foot are rare, although Platnauer's claim (*LEV* 26) that Propertius and Tibullus contain none and Ovid only four does not merit unreserved credence. His method of determining sense-pauses, by examining punctuation marks in his chosen editions (an, I hope not unfair, inference from his definition of sense pauses, p. 24), gets him into difficulties: the one example he cites, *Am.* 3.8.16, has a much stronger sense-pause elsewhere in the line, as e.g. Kenney's punctuation makes clear (*scuta tulit; dextram tange, cruenta fuit*). Nevertheless, a survey of Heroidean pentameters confirms the general picture as painted by Platnauer; such a survey cannot avoid being subjective, but I have found only this line and 19.154 to contain a sense pause

that separates two grammatically independant sentences; I regard as weaker those pauses that come between a subordinate clause and the main clause upon which it is dependant, as at 20.150 and 154; likewise the pause at 1.38, which precedes a sentence whose verb is supplied from the preceding one, I feel to be less strong. Canace's three-word sentence at the end of the line is, then, striking and hammers home the diagnosis.

eram:
Bournecque-Prévost's printing of *erat*, read by F before correction and by seven other of Dörrie's mss., is misguided since, to yield any sense from it, one is forced to assign to *amans* a meaning it cannot bear ('je ne sauvais pas ce qu'était l'amour, mais c'était lui'). Cf. Housman (1929) 195. *eram* makes the point particularly succinctly: 'I did not know what a lover might be, but that was what I was'. In view of *esset* in the same line, *eram* to *erat* would have been an easy corruption.

35 malum:
Given the preceding list of physical complaints, *malum* probably takes the primary meaning 'a disease, illness, sickness' (*OLD* s.v. *malum*[1] 7b); but Canace has hit upon an elegiac commonplace: for love as a *malum* see *TLL* s.v. *malum* 227.73ff.

nutrix:
That Euripides' lost *Aeolus* featured a τρόφος is attested by the fragmentary hypothesis. Her exact function in the play can only be guessed at; however, the final phrases of the hypothesis before it breaks off, which refer to the τρόφος in connection with the child (τὸ . . . γεννηθὲν) and a gathering (συνδραμόντες), are likely to refer to the scene described by Ovid at 69–72 (cf. 69ff.n.).

Whether the nurse's roles of diagnostician, would-be abortionist and midwife were part of the pre-Ovidian myth is uncertain (the absence of such details from the hypothesis does not preclude their presence in the play: see Williams (1992) 202 on the unreliable nature of hypotheses); but as presented in Canace's letter they are wholly elegiac and, moreover, Ovidian.

animo . . . anili:
Old women are often experts in matters of love: so the bawd of comedy and elegy, and the old nurse of tragedy. Occasionally, however, they bungle the diagnosis (thus, at [Virgil] *Ciris* 237ff., the old

nurse Carme, noticing that Scylla is taking an interest in her sleeping father's hair, comes to the wrong conclusion that she is in love with him, a misdiagnosis that R.O.A.M. Lyne (1978) 185, attributes to borrowings from Cinna's *Zmyrna*), or, as in the case of Myrrha's nurse at *Met.* 10.389ff., take a circuitous route before arriving at it.

praesensit:
So Myrrha's nurse, following an elegiac sigh from her ward, *aliquemque . . . praesentit amorem* (*Met.* 10.404).

36 'Aeoli . . . amas!':
The *nutrix* is particularly qualified to make this proclamation (see on *animo . . . anili*); but it can be made by anyone, provided the symptoms of love are striking enough: cf. *Ars* 1.737–8 . . . *miserabilis esto,/ut qui te videat, dicere possit 'amas'.* Hollis (1977), in his note there, finds the 'motif of an onlooker deducing from the appropriate symptoms that a man is in love' to be as early as Callimachus *Epigr.* 43, and Asclepiades (born c. 320 B.C.) *Anth. Graec.* 12.135.

37:
Cf. Cydippe's reaction to reading aloud the word *coniugium*: *nomine coniugii dicto confusa pudore/sensi me totis erubuisse genis,/luminaque in gremio veluti defixa tenebam* (21.113–5).

38:
A neat and succinct phrasing of the common conceit of speaking without words (for which see e.g. McKeown (1989) on *Amores* 1.7.21–2 *sed taciti fecere tamen convicia vultus;/egit me lacrimis ore silente reum*).

39–40:
The description is recognisably of a pregnancy (for a similar use of *pondus* and *aegra*, cf. Statius *Ach.* 1.672–3 *surgentemque uterum atque aegros in pondere menses/occuluit*; on *pondus* see further Knox; for *onus* see *OLD* q.v. 1b and *TLL* q.v. 646.1ff.), but so phrased as to convey a 'sense of remove, almost awe' (Jacobson (1974) 169) on the part of the *nova miles.* It is not Canace herself, but *pondera* and *onus* that are the subjects of *tumescebant* and *gravabat* respectively: her body gets on with the business of pregnancy as if of its own accord. Heinsius' conjecture *tumescebam . . . pondere*, if adopted, would spoil this 'distancing' effect.

39 iamque tumescebant:

That the conversation between Canace and her nurse has not reached a conclusion is suggested by logic, and supported by literary precedents, which promote the expectation that the nurse will disover the beloved's identity and pledge her assistance. Verducci (1985) 213 cites the nurse-scene of Euripides' *Hippolytus* as such a precedent; one more immediate to Ovid may have been contained in Cinna's lost *Zmyrna*: according to Lyne's reconstruction of that work in his commentary on the *Ciris* (see Lyne (1978) on *Ciris* 206–38 for his method), Zmyrna's nurse discovered the truth of her ward's affliction (Lyne on *Ciris* 254), reacted to the revelation (Lyne on 286ff.) and promised to help (Lyne on 338f.). Canace's nurse no doubt acted in a similar fashion, and one anticipates that the narrative will bring the scene to a conclusion.

iamque tumescebant, however, moves the reader on to a point in time when Canace is already pregnant: the imperfect tense of the verb ensures that we hit the ground running. It is not, one realises, merely the conclusion of the nurse-scene that has been suppressed, but also the conception of Canace's child. At 38, Canace is blushing at having her unfamiliar experience diagnosed as love; at 39 she is several weeks pregnant. Dryden, perhaps more unimaginatively, supplied the following lines:

> 'Forc'd at the last my shameful Pain I tell:
> And, oh, what folllow'd! we both know too well!
> "When half denying, more than half content,
> "Embraces warm'd me to a full Consent:
> "Then with tumultuous Joys my Heart did beat,
> "And Guilt that made them anxious made them great'.

Ovid's suppression of events is, as Verducci (1985) 213 suggests, both surprising and comic; yet it is not simply Ovid, but the narrator herself that makes the omission. Canace's *pudor* (cf. 37, 54) and the nature of her union with Macareus (see next n.) motivate the censorship.

vitiati:

The participle looks back at what the narrative left out: the loss of Canace's virginity (see *OLD* s.v. *vitio* 3 'to impair by violating the virginity of, deflower').

Adams (1982) 198 remarks that 'a sexual act may be spoken of as an act of violence or corruption even if it is not regarded as such

by the perpetrator (or even victim)'. In some cases the context in which *vitio virginem* or sim. occurs stipulates that the phrase refers to rape: so e.g. at Tacitus *Dial.* 35.5 *vitiatarum electiones* of the oratorical *topos* where the choice open to a rape victim— 'death for the rapist or marriage to him', see e.g. Seneca *Con.* 8.6 and Quintilian *Decl.* 280—is discussed. In others it does not: one cannot judge, for example, from the occurrence of *vitio* at *Met.* 4.798 *hanc* [sc. *Medusam*] *pelagi rector templo vitiasse Minervae/dicitur* (the only other place in Ovid where the verb is used in a sexual context) whether Ovid had in mind an act of violence; that Hesiod set this same union between Medusa and Poseidon in a fragrant meadow, *Theogony* 278–9 τῇ δὲ μιῇ παρελέξατο Κυανοχαίτης/ἐν μαλακῷ λειμῶνι και ἄνθεσι εἰαρινοῖσιν, might suggest that he at any rate had in mind a peaceable scene.

However, a sexual act will not be described with the vocabulary of violence by a woman who wishes to present themselves as having been a willing participant: according to the *praeceptor amoris* of the *Ars Amatoria*, even though women enjoy violent love-making, they give the impression of abhorring it (*Ars* 1.677–8 *quae cum posset cogi non tacta recessit,/ut simulet vultu gaudia, tristis erit*). Knox comments that 'the directness of Canace's description is arresting', but *vitiati* is more than a direct description; it hints at the violence on Macareus' part that is found in other versions of the myth. Cf. 27n., 59–64n.

ventris:
The everyday word for 'womb'; see *OLD* s.v. *venter* 4, Adams (1982) 100f.

40 furtivum:
'*furtivum* suggests not only her attempts to conceal her pregnancy, but the fact that it was the result of a clandestine love-affair, a common meaning of *furtum*' (Knox). Cf. Seneca *Ag.* 732, where M.A. Del Rio (1576) glossed *furtivum genus* as 'nati ex furtivo coitu' (R.J. Tarrant (1976), though he supports the authenticity of *Ag.* 730ff. against the attacks of early scholars, believes that the phrase means 'adulterer'). By applying *furtivus* to the *onus* rather than to the act by which it was conceived, and *vitiati* in the preceding line to her womb rather than to herself, Canace attempts to dissociate herself from the encounter with Macareus (cf. *Hypermestra* and her *manus* in 14: see 14.5n. *manus*).

41 herbas . . . medicamina

The nurse administers pessaries (see my note on *supposuit*) in an attempt to effect an abortion. According to Canace's account, the nurse is the prime mover: it is she who, unbidden by her ward, acquires and applies the abortifacients. Even so, the sympathy elicited for Canace by her situation, and in particular by Aeolus' cruelty towards her child, must surely be tempered in view of this episode.

The administering of drugs, either orally or by pessaries, is the means of attempting an abortion most commonly attested in antiquity (E. Nardi (1971) 632). However, at *Am.* 2.14.3 and 27, the military metaphor that runs through that poem prompts Ovid to mention a less common method (according to S.K. Dickison (1973) 165, Ovid's is 'the first mention in Roman sources'), which involves the application of a sharp object, = *telum* (cf. *Fast.* 1. 623–4 *ictu temeraria caeco/visceribus crescens excutiebat onus*); and it might seem surprising that, in providing Canace's nurse with *medicamina* rather than arming her with a *telum*, Ovid has passed up the opportunity to make the most of the military metaphor of 45–6 (see n.).

It is not simply that Ovid is loath to repeat a trick from the *Amores*. His choice of method for Canace's abortion attempt is wholly apposite, since *medicamina* are the business of a *nutrix*; 'the nurse [employs] the conventional Euripidean *pharmaka*, but to a very different end' (Verducci (1985) 213). One might go further. It is generally agreed that Canace's abortion attempt is an invention of Ovid's, and not present in Euripides *Aeolus* (e.g. Verducci 214, Knox)—a reasonable speculation, and not simply because there is no mention of it in the hypothesis, or indeed elsewhere in extant literature: such an episode would, as far as one can judge, have contributed nothing to the dramatic action of the play (contrast Hermione's accusation in Euripides *Andromache* that Andromache administered to her drugs that made her sterile, which motivates the emnity between the two women), whereas Ovid's fascination with the willingness of girls to put their lives at risk in order to terminate a pregnancy is evident from *Am.* 2.13 and 14. However, Canace's abortion attempt may yet have been suggested by an episode in the *Aeolus*. The hypothesis notes that Canace concealed the birth of her child by pretending to be ill (ἡ δ' ἔγκυος γενήθεῖσα/τὸν τόκον ἔκρυπτεν τῷ νοσεῖν προ[σποιη-/τῶς) and it is not hard to imagine that the nurse brought drugs into Canace's chamber in order to keep up the pretence. Verses 41–4 of Ovid's epistle would represent a revised version of such an episode:

Canace declares that the illness was genuine (40 *aegra*), and that the drugs brought into her chamber were for the purpose of an abortion. Like Macareus himself, the reader would be familiar with the existence of the drugs themselves, but not with their true purpose; cf. the ambiguous φάρμακον in Euripides *Hippolytus* (M.R. Halleran (1995) on 478–9; contrast W.S. Barrett (1964)). Note how Canace gradually reveals, to Macareus and to us alike, what the *medicamina* were used for: before the revelation of 44, there are hints at the truth in 42 *audaci* (near-synonyms are used in connection with abortion at *Am.* 2.13.1 *temeraria*, 2.14.17 *temerasset* and 2.14.24 *crudeli manu*) and *supposuit* (see n.).

42 supposuitque:
The prefix *sub-* here refers to the application of the drugs as a pessary, and not, as Micyllus wished, to stealth ('*supposuit*: id est clam admovit'). See *OLD* s.v. *suppono* 2b, and cf. e.g. *Am.* 2.14.27 *subeictis* for a similar use of *sub-*. 'The use of vaginal suppositaries (pessaries) is frequently recommended in the medical sources as a means of both preventing contraception and causing abortion' (J.M. Riddle (1992) 7).

43 hoc te celavimus unum:
For women concealing their abortion attempts from the father (or suspected father), cf. *Am.* 2.13.3 *illa* [sc. *Corinna*] *quidem clam me tantum molita pericli*.

44:
Ovid reused the line, with only a change of the verb's mood and voice to suit the syntactical context, at *Fast.* 1.624 *visceribus crescens excutiebat* [sc. *matrona*] *onus* (cited by Burman). The choice of word for Canace's womb (see *OLD* s.v. *viscus* 3b) is telling, inasmuch as it is picked up by 92 *viscera*, of the child itself (*OLD* q.v. 5). The verbal correspondance (made more prominent by the fact that both words occupy first place in their respective lines) brings together in the reader's mind the attempted abortion and Canace's horror at seeing her child taken away to be exposed, and encourages consideration of the one in the light of the other.

45–6:
The heroine assigns to the unborn child a personality of his own: he withstands the strategems employed against him. The military

metaphor familiar from *Am.* 2.14 here portrays the attempted abortion as a siege waged against a resistant enemy: *admotis*, used of moving up siege-engines, *OLD* s.v. *admoveo* 1b; *restitit; artibus*, of military devices, *OLD* s.v. *ars* 3; *tecto*, of the protected position of the besiegers, cf. e.g. Caesar *Gal.* 8.41.4 *cuniculos tectos*; and *tutus ab hoste*. The use of *infans* of both the foetus here and the newborn child at 69 and 75 strengthens the 'pathetic fallacy' (other occurrences of *infans* = 'unborn child' are 7.137, *Met.* 3.310, 7.126, 10.503, *Fast.* 1.33). Moreover, the failure of the abortion is seen from the perspective of the child (Verducci (1985) 215); to him, the outside world is hidden (*tecto*), the perpetrators of the attempt enemies (*hoste*). '[Canace's] pride in her unborn baby who successfully manages to fight against the threat to his life' (Jacobson (1974) 170), a pride made evident in both the personification and the choice of perspective, is all the more poignant since she now fears for the baby's life.

This expression of pride would be unallayed were it not for the initial three words of the couplet. *nimium vivax* indicates regret at the foetus' tenacity to life, and is intensified by the interjection *a* (*a* is read by the majority of Dörrie's mss. and is supported over Naugerius' conjecture *at* by examples of *a nimium* at 5.123, 16.287, *Fast.* 2.45; *at nimium* does not occur in Ovid). This is not simply the regret of one cheated of a successful abortion: Canace the narrator, with the benefit of hindsight, knows that, had her child not been born, she would not now be facing death; and she believes that the child himself, though once *nimium vivax*, will soon be dead.

Jacobson loc. cit. considers 41–6 'a fine description . . . of the conflict in a woman who feels it necessary to abort, yet cannot but help feeling strongly for her child'. The conflict is in fact contained wholly within the couplet 45–6, and is more particular to Canace's case than Jacobson suggests.

46 tecto:

Regularly suspected since P.H. Damsté (1905) 34–5 as a corruption through dittography with *tutus*; Damsté conjectured *quovis*, M.D. Reeve (1973) 328 *caeco*, and W.S. Watt (1985) 56 *infesto*. Keep *tecto*, which contributes well to the metaphor of siege-warfare (see previous n.).

47 orta:

orior refers to the rising of the moon at the start of its monthly cycle, as at *Met.* 8.11 *sexta resurgebant orientis cornua lunae*.

soror . . . Phoebi:
i.e. Luna, through her association with Diana/Artemis, the twin sister of Phoebus Apollo. For the equation Diana = Luna, see e.g. *Met.* 15.196–7 *nec par aut eadem nocturnae forma Dianae/esse potest umquam* and Catullus 34.15–6 [to Diana] *et notho es/dicta lumine Luna*; also *Her.* 18.74 where the moon is addressed as Cynthia, a title of Diana's (see *OLD* s.v. *Cynthia* 1b for other occurrences of Cynthia applied to the moon). Bömer (1969–1986) on *Met.* 2.208–9 *fraternos currere Luna/admiratur equos* remarks 'Die Gleichung [i.e. the identification of Luna with Diana/Artemis] war zu Ciceros Zeit noch durchaus problematisch . . ., bei Ovid ist sie selbstverständlich'. The identification here is a happy one: Diana is goddess of childbirth.

pulcherrima:
Leander's testimony to the beauty of Luna/Diana (18.69 *A Veneris facie non est prior ulla tuaque*) is not as reliable as Canace's, given that it is a compliment addressed to her face (*tua* there is 'a politic afterthought', Kenney).

47ff.:
Canace describes her labour and the birth of her child—an element of the myth whose potential to shock was exploited in some versions: note esp. the anecdote that Nero acted out the rôle of 'Canace giving birth' (Cassius Dio 62.10.2, Suetonius *Nero* 21.3); the birth may have been represented in Euripides *Aeolus* (it is mentioned by the hypothesis; and cf. the allegation that Euripides depicted on stage 'women giving birth in temples', Aristophanes *Frogs* 1080). Ovid makes of it a striking scene: Canace surrounded by her nurse and personified figures (54n., 57n.); the sudden appearance of the violently passionate Macareus (59–64n.); his assertion that they will marry, believed, but tragically not understood (63–4n.).

48 plenaque:
The first word of this line has been much discussed. P and two other of Dörrie's mss. read *nonaque*; the rest, with one exception which I discuss below, read *denaque.*

The couplet 47–8 must advance the narrative to the point when Canace goes into labour (49 *subitos dolores*). Phrases expressing the human gestation period are common in Latin literature (many are

cited by A.S. Pease (1958) on Cicero *N.D.* 2.69). References to ten-month-long pregnancies (the most commonly cited example is Virgil *Ecl.* 4.61 *matri longa decem tulerunt fastidia menses*) produced much confusion, until it was realized that they refer to ten lunar months (Herescu (1955) quelled any lingering doubts). This explains why pregancies can be said to be either nine (calendar) or ten (lunar) months long. However, human gestation periods do not always last for this period of time, either in practice or in literature. For pregnancies lasting nine lunar months see Cicero *N.D.* 2.69 and *Met.* 10.295–7 (whether *Met.* 2.453 and 10.479 refer to the full gestation period is uncertain, since in each case the passage of time does not herald an immediate birth).

That *denaque* cannot stand was observed by Housman (1920) on Manilius 4.451: if a number is the correct reading, it must be an ordinal number; and *denaque luna* would mean, not 'the tenth moon', but 'ten moons each'. Dörrie was upbraided by G.P. Goold (1974) 478 for printing *denaque*, but he is not in bad company: Lindemann, Merkel, Palmer, Giomini, Bornecque-Prévost, and Verducci (1985) all prefer *denaque* (Verducci, inexplicably, translates *noviens . . . denaque* as 'for the eighth time . . . for the tenth time'). Before proceeding further, one must establish the sense of *movebat.* It has widely been taken to mean 'was setting in motion', referring, therefore, to the beginning of a lunar month: so Bornecque-Prévost, 'mettait en mouvement'; and Showerman-Goold, 'was beginning to stir'. Goold (1974) 478 cited *Met.* 14.228 *cum sese aurora moveret* as a parallel in support of this sense, but there it is the subject of the verb (i.e. *aurora*), not the verb itself, that sets the time as being at the beginning of the (in this case, daily solar) cycle. *movebat equos* may apply to a journey that has just begun (as Valerius Flaccus 3.415 *movet en gelidos Latonia currus* perhaps refers to the beginning of the moon's night-time trek), but it is not the phrase one would choose to refer specifically to setting off: see *Am.* 1.2.26 and *Ars* 1.3 for *movere* used of driving, not setting in motion, a chariot.

As noted above, a pregnancy ending in the ninth lunar month would not be unparalleled in literature: *nonaque*, then, is, on the face of it, a possibility. However, *nonaque . . . Luna movebat equos* would add nothing to the hexameter (cf. Reeve (1973) 328): 47 would inform us that the ninth moon has risen, 48 that it is at an unspecified point in its journey (*movebat*). Moreover, an ordinal number with *luna*

is found nowhere else in Latin in the sense 'the *n*th moon'; see however *TLL* s.v. *luna* 1833.63ff. for the sense 'the *n*th day after the full moon'. *nonaque* is weak, and clearly a false reading.

Housman suggested *et nova* (followed by Knox), Watt (1995) 91 *proxima,* both of which seem rather bland, and (unless we grant that Ovid has omitted to mention the rising of the tenth moon) rely on *movebat* to carry the meaning 'was setting in motion' which, as we have seen, it is not specifically equipped to do; moreover, Housman's *nova* . . . *Luna* would hardly be driving *luciferos* . . . *equos*. Bentley's *pronaque* (*OLD.* s.v. *pronus* 5b 'of things moving in a downward plane; esp. of the sun, stars, etc., moving towards their setting') was followed by Reeve (1973) 327–8. It is a possibility; but, *pace* Reeve, *pronus* would be less likely to pertain to the moon's monthly course, as is required, than to its nightly one: cf. the sole Ovidian example of *pronus* of a heavenly body, *Met.* 11.257 *pronus erat Titan* (= 'it was late afternoon').

J.F. Gronovius (1639) proposed *plenaque* (wrongly attributed by most edd. to Bentley), which *Met.* 10.295–7, quoted above, greatly supports. There, birth takes place at the full moon of the ninth month. So here. Our line should read:

plenaque luciferos Luna movebat equos

The hexameter specifies the ninth month of pregnancy, the pentameter the middle of that month. Reeve's objection to *plena,* that it produces a mix of the literal (full moon) and the figurative (moon as charioteer, *movebat equos*) is no objection at all: Ovid enjoys exploiting the dual identity of gods that are also natural phenomena (14.89n.). *plenus* also happens to be a fit adjective to employ in connection with a pregnancy. *penaque,* read by one of Dörrie's mss., may suggest the route of corruption to *denaque; nonaque* would then have been an easy change, given *noviens* in the line above.

49 dolores:

To Canace, they were simply pains; those less *nescia* can identify them as birth-pangs (*TLL* s.v. *dolor* 1839.36–51).

50 rudis ad partus:

For the construction, cf. 17.143 *sum rudis ad Veneris furtum, OLD* s.v. *rudis* 6c.

nova miles:

Canace moves from narration of the attempted abortion to that of the birth, but rather tastelessly retains the same metaphor (cf. 45–6n.). The *militia* of childbirth is a motif exploited by Ovid elsewhere (cf. Knox, McKeown (1998) on *Am.* 2.14.5–6), and might have its roots in Medea's famous claim that she would rather fight three battles than once give birth (Euripides *Medea* 250–1, Ennius *Medea* fr. 109 Jocelyn). This is the same mischevious attitude towards soldiery as in Ovid's comparisons of a lover's life with that of a soldier, for which see esp. *Am.* 1.9 with McKeown (1989); the hardships endured by a soldier are there equated with those of a lover, here with those of a parturient woman. The gender of *miles*, made explicit in *nova*, draws attention to the incongruity of the comparison: Palmer compares 6.82 *non expectata . . . hoste*, but Dörrie there prints the alternative ms. reading *expectato*; for *miles* of a woman, cf. *Met.* 2.415 of Callisto, and, as a collective noun, *Her.* 6.54 of the Lemnian women. For *novus miles* of the raw recruit, see e.g. Sallust *Jug.* 87.2, and Livy 21.40.4 and 22.12.1; for *rudis* so used, see Knox.

51 crimina:

= 'misdeeds'; see *OLD* s.v. *crimen* 4. The plural is vague enough to take in Canace's love, its consummation and her pregnancy. The child itself is a *crimen* at 66, a line superficially similar to 4.58 *enixa est* [sc. Pasiphae] *utero crimen onusque suo*; however, Pasiphae's child, the minotaur, is a *crimen* because its very form is a testimony to its unnatural parentage, whereas Canace's *crimen* is simply that she had an affair at all. In Canace's case, the word need contain no reference to the incestuousness of her relationship (cf. 23–6n.): *crimen* = 'love affair' is a highly common designation in Ovid; for its application to *liaisons* involving unmarried girls see e.g. 20.9 and *Ars* 3.632.

52 oraque . . . pressit:

i.e. stopped her from making a sound. *premo* is found with the object *ora* or *vocem* of closing one's own mouth or checking one's own speech (see *OLD* s.v *premo* 27 and 21): for someone or something silencing another, cf. Silius Italicus 2.279–80 *'cuncta quidem, patres . . . premunt formidine vocem'*, and Virgil *Aen.* 7.117–119 *ea vox audita laborum/prima tulit finem, primamque loquentis ab ore/eripuit pater ac stupefactus numine pressit* which is likely to portray Aeneas as checking his son's exclamation

that marks the fulfilment of a prophecy and an end to the Trojans' wanderings (see C.J. Fordyce (1977) on *Aen.* 7.119 *pressit* for a discussion on the possible interpretations). Palmer considers the method of silencing Canace's groans to be a physical one (cf. Drydens translation, '. . . *my Cries encreast,/ Which with her Hand the conscious Nurse supprest*'), and tentatively suggests a similarly physical sense for *pressit* at *Aen.* 7. In Canace's case, the object *ora* does indeed create the picture of the nurse with her hand over the mouth of her ward. At *Aen.* 7, however, both the implied object of *pressit* (= *vocem*) and the required tone (the image of Aeneas with his hand clamped over his son's mouth is out of keeping with the sollemnity of the moment) suggest that the phrase describes a less physical means of silencing, such as that employed by Jupiter at *Met.* 1.205–6 *qui postquam voce manuque* [= hand gesture; we are not to imagine him going among the Olympians to press his hand to the mouth of each in turn]/*murmura conpressit, tenuere silentia cuncti.*

clamantis:
For the genitive participle of possessor with *mei* understood, see 13.13n.

conscia:
Either feminine singular, agreeing with *anus*, or neuter plural, with *ora*. All translators from Planudes (ἡ δὲ συνίστωρ πρεσβῦτις), if they translate *conscia* at all (Isbell (1990) does not), opt for the former. The latter, *ora . . . conscia*, won the support of *TLL* (s.v. *conscius* 371.64–5), and would translate as 'my guilty face'—i.e. the face of a guilty person—as at *Am.* 2.5.34 and *Ibis* 158; or, if *ora* = mouth, perhaps as 'my mouth that revealed my guilt' (a similar use of the adjective occurs at Catullus 65.24 *conscius . . . rubor*, of the blush that accompanies a girl's inadvertant disclosure of a love-token). However, the appearance at 19.26, *Rem.* 637 and *Met.* 9.707 of a *conscia nutrix/anus* dissuades the reader here from taking *conscia with ora*, as too does distribution of modifiers: *clamantis* qualifies *ora*, *conscia* qualifies *anus*.

53–6:
Canace's narration of the conflict between her need to cry out and the factors that prevented her is accompanied by a shift into the present tense. Such 'vivid' present tenses are common in *Her.*, often denoting the narrator's self-immersion in an emotionally-charged part

of the story: cf. esp. Hypermestra's narrative (e.g. 14.21n., 37–8n., 67–70n., 85–108n.).

54:
The syllepsis places the abstract nouns *timor* and *pudor* on the same plane as the *nutrix*: we are to imagine all three by her bedside urging silence (cf. 57n. for a further arrival at the bedside).

timor:
Her fear is no doubt as much of detection as for her life (see 58).

55 contineo:
A reminder of P's fallibility: along with all save one of Dörrie's chief mss., it gives the inferior *continuo*.

reprendo:
For the contraction, cf. *Met.* 15.526–7 *membra rapi partim, partim reprensa relinqui . . . videres*. Bömer (1969–1986) there remarks that where Ovid employs the contracted form the sense of the verb is 'zurückhalten' (= 'hold back'), while Ovidian occurrences of the uncontracted *reprehendere* (20.51, *Pont.* 3.4.78, 3.9.5; cf. *Her.* 17.221 *reprehensor*, = 'one who finds fault') translate as 'tadeln' (= 'rebuke'). It is impossible to judge from this handful of examples whether this is deliberate or coincidental. A glance at *OLD* s.v. *repre(he)ndo* is sufficient to demonstrate that the distinction is not, at any rate, a universal one.

Burman cites Terence *Ad.* 623 *sensi ilico id illas suspicari, sed me reprehendi tamen* as a parallel for *repre(he)ndere* in the context of refraining from speech. The variant ms. readings (in addition to those recorded by Dörrie, Burman claims to have found *repono* and *recondo*) are likely to stem from scribal unfamiliarity with the contracted form: note similar variants at *Met.* 15.526, and the lack of them where Ovid employs the uncontracted verb.

Provided that *elapsa* is taken as a true past participle, not standing for a present participle as is possible with deponent verbs, Canace's assertion—'I take back (*OLD* s.v. *repre(he)ndo* 2) the words that have already escaped my lips (*OLD* s.v. *elabor* 1c "(of secrets or sim.) to be uttered inadvertantly")'—is a striking one; as Palmer remarks, stronger than Aeschinus' *me reprehendi* at Terence *Ad.* 623, and somewhat weakened in translations that attribute to *reprendo* a conative sense it does not possess (thus Showerman-Goold and Verducci (1985) 184 'try to

take back', and Isbell (1990) 'try to capture'). Her statement in its full force is a negation of the commonplace 'a word spoken is past recalling'; the motif lends itself to colourful imagery—of an arrow at Horace *Ep.* 1.18.71 *et semel emissum volat irrevocabile verbum*, of an animal, perhaps a bird (N. Rudd (1989)), at *A.P.* 390 *nescit vox missa reverti*—and Ovid's *elapsa . . . reprendo* might suggest the recapturing of a fugitive.

56 lacrimas combibere ipsa meas:
This the first extant occurrence of such an expression should be taken literally, despite the fact that later examples (*Fast.* 4.845–6 *lacrimas introrsus obortas/devorat*, *Met.* 13.539–40 *et pariter vocem lacrimasque introrsus obortas/devorat ipse dolor*, Seneca *Ep.* 49.1 *lacrimas conbibentem*) are taken to be metaphorical and equivalent to *compressit lacrimas.* The intensifying *ipsa meas* seems somewhat redundant unless one assumes the literal interpretation, that Canace is drinking up her own tears, to be correct.

57:
So imminent does Canace's death appear to herself that *Mors* seems to enter her field of vision. Death is an unwelcome addition to the group by the heroine's bed (54n.). Help from the goddess of childbirth (*Lucina*) is not forthcoming (*opem . . . negabat*).

58 si morerer . . . erat:
The construction of the conditional clause, comprising an imperfect subjunctive and imperfect indicative, stresses just how imminent death was to Canace (cf. 57 *mors erat ante oculos* and 65 *mortua, crede mihi*): for an indicative in place of a subjunctive in the apodosis, see e.g. K-S 2.397f., and cf. e.g. *Am.* 1.6.34 *solus eram, si non saevus adesset Amor.* The tense of the verbs (imperfect rather than the pluperfect that would be expected in an unfulfilled condition in the past) may simply be influenced by the imperfect tenses of the two parallel clauses (57), or else represent the fact that the sentiment expressed in 58 still holds true.

59–64:
Macareus here makes his sole appearance in Canace's narrative. Despite the positive effect he has on Canace (60 *refovisti*, 65), Ovid's reader can again glimpse the violent Macareus familiar from the

mythological tradition (cf. 27n., 39n.). The stance he adopts in 59–60 is an overtly sexual one: Jacobson (1974) 171, (who nevertheless deems the position here described incongruous with Canace's condition, and apologetically calls the text into question) compares the lovers' embrace at *Anth. Graec.* 5.128.1 στέρνα περὶ στέρνοις, μαστῷ δ' ἐπὶ μαστὸν ἐρείσας. The verb *incumbere* (or, as I print, *superincumbere*: for *incumbere* immediately preceded by *super*, cf. *Met.* 15.21 and *Aen.* 5.858), though employed again by Canace at 119, here contributes to the reader's glimpse of a violently passionate Macareus: 'the verb incumbere often contains a threatening notion' (R.D. Williams (1960) on *Aen.* 5.858). Tearing clothes and hair (*scissa tunicaque comaque*), be they one's own or someone else's, is the mark of a hot-blooded youngster (*Ars* 3.569 *nec* [sc. *vetus miles*] *scindet tunicasve suas tunicasve puellae*). Whose hair and clothes Macareus tears is not specified: it is more natural to take them as his own (so Dryden (1680), Bornecque-Prévost, Knox); but the possibility that they are Canace's (so Showerman-Goold, Isbell (1990)) is not ruled out (Verducci (1985) rather confusingly supports the former on p. 217, the latter on p. 184). If Macareus is tearing at Canace, he is behaving like a violent elegiac lover (on hair-tearing, see e.g. McKeown (1989) on *Am.* 1.7.11; on the tearing of clothes, see e.g. op. cit. on 1.7.47–8), and worse than most given Canace's delicate condition.

61 soror, soror o carissima:
An audacious address: here and at 63 *fratri nam nupta futura es* Macareus dwells on the fact that his beloved is also his sister—he has no need to conceal it, since he has, the reader suspects, just persuaded his father to marry the sisters to the brothers (63–4n.). Contrast Byblis, who shrinks from addressing Caunus in fraternal terms, and desires to be not his lover-sister, but simply his lover (see *Met.* 9.466–7 *iam dominum appellat, iam nomina sanguinis odit:/Byblida iam mavult, quam se vocet ille sororem* and 487–8 *o ego, si liceat mutato nomine iungi,/quam bene, Caune, tuo poteram nurus esse parenti!*).

dixti:
The majority of editors print the reading of P and a handful of other mss., *aisti*, 'an inelegant elision and an impossible form' (Goold (1974) 477). According to Platnauer *LEV* 85, of 46 elisions at a weak fifth foot caesura in Ovid only five are elision of -ă, and only one of those is elision of a feminine singular ending (this single example

is probably our line: Platnauer merely gives the statistics without citing). This would also be the sole example of the second person perfect tense of *aio* before Augustine (cf. Knox). That editors print the reading of P when it is so unlikely reflects the sometimes unquestioning reverence in which that ms. is held (see intro.). In this case it is a large body of 'lesser' mss. that exhibit the correct reading, *dixti*: that it is found in any ms. at all is perhaps, as Goold suggested, a result of a medieval conjecture that with minimal change restored *dix(s)ti* from the corrupt *aisti*. The syncopated form *dixti* often causes the scribes some confusion: note the ms. variant(s) at Plautus *As.* 823 and *Men.* 1097 (*dixisti*), Cicero *N.D.* 3.23 (*dixi, dixisti*), and Martial 5.16.13 (*dicti, dixi*). Cf. 14.46n.

62 duos:

'Who are the two people to whom Macareus alludes?' (Knox). Canace and Macareus? Or Canace and her unborn child? Context and phrasing admit of either: on the elegiac commonplace that the welfare of a lover is inextricably linked with that of his mistress see E. Bréguet (1960); for a similar 'two in one' motif applied to a mother and her unborn baby cf. 7.139–40 and *Met.* 2.608–9.

Usually, when the 'two in one' motif occurs in Ovid, the reader is left in no doubt as to who the *duos* are. Our line is an exception (cf. *Am.* 2.13.15, with McKeown (1998) *ad loc.*). Bréguet 213 sees the ambiguity as an attempt by the poet to encompass two motifs with one cliché. However, this is not poetic skill exercised for its own sake. The ambiguity contributes to tragic irony.

For Macareus, *duos* means Canace and himself. This is no mere commonplace, nor even 'a supportive declaration of Macareus' love at this critical moment' (Jacobson (1974) 398). One can discern from the motif of Macareus' suicide in the pre-Ovidian myth (Hyginus *Fab.* 242.2 *Macareus Aeoli filius propter Canacen sororem, id est sponsam, ipse se interfecit*; Plato *Leg.* 8.838c . . . ἢ Μακαρέας τινὰς ἀδελφαῖς μειχθέντας λαθραίως, ὀφθέντας δὲ ἑτοίμως, θάνατον αὑτοῖς ἐπιτιθέντας δίκην τῆς ἁμαρτίας; pseudo-Plutarch *Moralia* 312c = *Parallel. Min.* 28a . . . ἄνομον κρίνασα [i.e. Canace] ἑαυτὴν διεργάσατο· ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ ὁ Μακαρεύς; Stobaeus 4.20.72 Μακαρεὺς . . . εὑρὼν δὲ τὴν ἀγαπωμένην αἱμορραγοῦσαν τῷ αὐτῷ ξίφει τὸν βίον περιέγραψε) that he means what he says. Canace, however, is ignorant both of erotic clichés (33–4) and of Macareus' impending suicide: she has her own plans for him to fulfil once she herself is dead (123ff.). The fact that

verse 62 may be applied as much to a mother and foetus as to two lovers allows Canace an opportunity to stay wholly in the dark concerning the further tragedy that will ensue after her own death.

63–4:
Macareus' words of assurance are brief and allusive. Canace takes heart, but does not realize their significance. Ovid's reader, familiar with the pre-Ovidian myth, recognizes the wider context: Macareus has just persuaded Aeolus to marry his daughters to his sons, and assumes that his bride will be Canace (hence the confident 64). As he speaks to Canace here, Macareus is unaware that Aeolus will assign the brides by lot, and that Canace will not be assigned to him. He will in the end secure the marriage he promises here, but this *spes bona* will ultimately be thwarted by Canace's own ignorance (cf. 17.236 *fallitur augurio spes bona saepe suo*). See Williams (1992) 206–7.

63 det vires:
'Let good hope give you strength'. The jussive subjunctive is preferable to the indicative *dat* read by several of Dörrie's mss.: an injunction better suits the context than a general observation. 'Good hope gives strength', however, did suit the editors of the florilegia, who had something of a penchant for gnomic statements (note their inclusion of e.g. 1.12, 3.4, 5.7–8, etc.): all of those cited here by Dörrie read the indicative.

fratri nam nupta futura es:
If not what Ovid wrote, then as near as is possible to discern. A host of variant readings, the majority of which consist solely or mainly of variation in word-order (only three—*fratri vis nubere? nube* and *nupta tibi credito verbis* and *fratri tibi nubere sit spes*—differ significantly from that printed by Dörrie), suggests that at some point early in the tradition the text was damaged and subsequently restored by conjecture. The sense is likely to be 'you will marry your brother'; only the precise wording is in doubt.

Palmer prints *fratris nam nupta futura es*, which is given by four of Dörrie's mss. and claimed by Dörrie as the erased text of P (having examined a photograph copy of that ms., I can neither confirm nor refute his claim, nor that of Giomini that the reading is rather *nuptura fratri futura es*; as both report, P. exhibits in its margin *fratri es nam nupta futura*). The dative *fratri* is more idiomatic: see Housman

(1899) 175. Whether one accepts Ehwald's *germano* [better than the genitive *germani* conjectured by Bentley and found in a handful of Dörrie's mss.] *nupta futura es* is simply a matter of taste: I feel the need for the connective *nam* and would therefore prefer *fratri.*

Dörrie's objection to *futura* ('dubium movet vox *futura* quippe quae glossematis vice in textum irrepisse videatur') is unreasonable. Macareus is here confident that the wedding is about to take place (63–4n.). For *futurus* applied to something imminent, see *OLD* q.v. 2.

64:

Punctuate, with the majority of editors, as follows:

> . . . *futura es;*
> *illius, de quo mater, et uxor eris.*

and translate (literally) 'of him, by whom you will be a mother, you will also be the wife': at any rate, some such rendering as Planudes' τῷ γὰρ ἀδελφῷ συζευχθήσῃ τῷδε, ἐξ οὗ καὶ μήτηρ ἔσῃ καὶ σύνευνος should be avoided.

The insertion of *es* before *de quo*, suggested by Heinsius, is metrically feasible: the resulting scansion of *illius* as a dactyl is wholly acceptable (McKeown (1989) on *Am.* 1.14.14, who gives comparative frequencies of *illĭus* and *illīus* in Augustan poetry, reports 14 Ovidian occurrences of the former and 26 of the latter; *TLL* s.v. *ille* 341.27 claims that a total of 60 lines of verse begin with *illĭus*). However, *es* is undesirable in 64, however it is included (Reeve (1973) 325 prefers the minority reading *es* for *et*). The repetition of *es* from the hexameter is clumsy; and, moreover, *mater*, while it may describe a mother-to-be (as at e.g. *Met.* 10.506), would only with great lack of tact be applied explicitly in the present tense to a woman in danger of losing both her as yet unborn child and her own life.

65–6:

Canace's sudden and dramatic response to Macareus' words finds expression in the metre: this is the epistle's only couplet with the maximum possible number of short syllables.

66 depositum est:

Editors print the *et positum est* of the mss.; but while *deponere* + *onus* or sim. is used elsewhere of childbirth (Burman cites Phaedrus 1.18.5 and compares the Greek ἀποτίθημι at Callimachus *Hymn* 1.15 and

3.25; Palmer adds Catullus 34.8 and Phaedrus 1.19.4), the simple verb is without parallel in this context (though used of egg-laying at *Met.* 8.258).

Met. 1.300 *deformes ponunt sua pignora phocae* ('give birth to their offspring') will not support *ponere* here: the true reading there is *ponunt sua corpora* ('disport their bodies'), as is clear not simply from the fact that 'all good mss. give *corpora*' (Palmer), but also from context: during the flood, the fields once grazed by slender she-goats (299 *graciles capellae*) are now occupied by ugly seals. Any reference to parturition is, to say the least, unexpected, whereas *ponunt sua corpora* suits the image of ungainliness already suggested by *deformes* (for seals as corpulent creatures, see e.g. *Met.* 7.389 *tumidam phocen*).

Burman claims to have found in one ms. the reading *depositumque uteri*, of which he approves ('. . . *quod non displicet*'; at *Met.* 1.300, however, to support *ponunt sua pignora*, he quotes our line as given by the mss.). I suggest *depositum est uteri*: the resulting asyndeton suits the headlong pace of the couplet; another possibility is *expositum est*, recorded by Giomini as a supralineal reading in one ms.

67 quid tibi grataris:

The phrase is heavy with dramatic irony. Canace seems to regard Macareus' self-congratulation as simply the reaction of a new father (cf. 6.119–20 *gratare ambobus, Iason—/dulce mihi gravidae fecerat auctor onus*; in our line, *quid mihi grataris*, the reading of B, is an understandable slip, given that congratulations are commonly offered to the new mother herself, e.g. *Met.* 9.312–3); and she rebukes him for having forgotten the need to smuggle the child past Aeolus. Ovid's reader knows that Macareus' happiness stems at least in part from having prevailed upon Aeolus and, as he thinks, secured Canace as his bride (63–4n.). The failure of the nurse's ill-considered scheme to conceal the child will necessitate a second approach to Aeolus to resecure his favour (see intro.).

grataris marks a return to vivid present-tenses, which are sustained throughout the 'discovery episode' (through to verse 82). The direct question in the present tense, however, is particularly striking, an indication of the extent to which Canace immerses herself in her narrative. Jacobson (1974) 360 overstates the point somewhat: '. . . the present tense in combination with the applicability of the sentiment to the actual present situation obscures the temporal definition of the question . . . [it] could be either Canace's response to her immediate

calamitous plight, or else a translation to the present of her earlier perplexity. Only the ensuing remarks offer clarification'; the possibility that *grataris* is a 'real' present tense is ruled out by the immediate context. But the present tense may yet add an extra layer of irony: as Canace writes, Macareus is indeed congratulating himself, as he rushes to bring her good news ('. . . we are to imagine Macareus first pleading with his father and then rushing to Canace's chamber with the good new of her reprieve, arriving only moments too late', Williams (1992) 207; cf my intro.).

media sedet Aeolus aula:

A fine example of Ovid's ability to appropriate the grand lines of Virgil for more lowly means. At *Aen.* 1.56 *celsa sedet Aeolus arce*, the poet 'imposingly shows the autocratic power of Aeolus over his prisoners [sc. the winds]' (Austin (1971)). Ovid borrows the phrase with minor modification to describe a mundane practical detail necessary for the plot. The sole route out of Canace's bedroom will take the nurse past Aeolus himself: she must therefore have recourse to subterfuge (68 *subripienda*). Thus Dryden (1680) freely translates 'High in his Hall, rock'd in a Chair of State,/the King with his tempestuous Council Sate;/Thro' this large Room our only passage lay,/By which we could the new-born Babe convey'. Virgil's expression of Aeolus' sovereignty becomes Canace's statement of her father's frustratingly effective vantage-point. The jingle *Aeolus aula*, as perhaps also in Neptune's disdainful comment '*illa se iactet in aula/Aeolus*' (*Aen.* 1.140–1), sounds a note of bathos.

69ff.:

The *nutrix* conceals the newborn child among ritual items in order to smuggle it past the omnipresent Aeolus. The scene was almost certainly treated in some form or other in Euripides *Aeolus* (cf. 35n. *nutrix*): this would explain Ovid's brief and allusive treatment of the episode (cf. Knox). It seems likely that the child is imagined as concealed in a ritual basket (κάλαθος), as e.g. the baby Ericthonius in Callimachus *Hecale*. Euripides may have specified a particular religious ceremony—perhaps a rite to Demeter, which would have been ideally suited to keeping the child secret from Aeolus: men were usually excluded from rites to that goddess (cf. 72 *dat pater ipse viam*), and the unititiated were forbidden to look into the basket (see e.g. Hopkinson (1984)).

Canace's account of the episode (all of which, one presumes, she observed from her bed, where, at any rate, we find her at 80) is terse and suspenseful: note the staccato sentences; the imperfect verb *erat* (73) that delays the reader just before the crucial moment, and hints at the impending failure of the nurse's mission; the *enjambement* of *venit* (74) and of *Aeolus* (76) in describing the discovery (cf. Knox); the use of similes (77–8n.).

The concealment of what is in the eyes of the reader the crime of incest by means of a fictitious holy rite creates a certain tension; but Verducci (1985) 219, esp. 'The effect of this distich somewhat mars the shallow veneer of the scene', and, to some extent, Jacobson (1974) 170 seem to labour the point, especially if one holds that the detail was already familiar from Euripides *Aeolus*.

69 frondibus:
With some orthographical deviations (see below), the large majority of mss. give *frondibus*. However, several editors, including Dörrie, have seen fit to print *frugibus*, the reading of three mss.; that P is among these three may have been something of an attraction.

Heinsius and Bornecque-Prévost favour *frugibus*, taking it to mean *mola salsa*, the sacrificial meal sprinkled on the head of the victim. For *frux* so used, see *Met.* 15.134, *Aen.* 12.173 *fruges . . . salsas*, and *Aen.* 2.133 where *salsae fruges* occurs along with *vittae* (cf. 70 *vittis*); in our line, however, *frugibus* has no wider context or qualifying adjective that would even suggest *mola salsa*. *frugibus* is better taken as either 'fruits' (Showerman-Goold, Verducci, Isbell) or 'ears of corn' (Palmer): this interpretation would perhaps suggest a rite to Demeter (Knox; cf. my previous n.); but it would leave the noun in desperate need of an accompanying adjective or descriptive phrase, just as *ramis* has *albentis olivae* (for the paleness of the olive-plant, cf. e.g. *Met.* 6.81 and Silius Italicus 13.69 *canentis olivae*, Virgil *Ecl.* 5.16 *pallenti . . . olivae*, [Virgil] *Ciris* 148 *pallentis olivae*, and Juvenal 14.144 *montem qui canet oliva*) and *vittis* has *levibus*.

One might take *albentis olivae* with *frugibus* as well as with *ramis* (*fruges olivae* being the olives themselves). The *nutrix*, however, though doomed to failure, is *sedula* (70), and chooses the instruments of concealment carefully: they must not only seem appropriate for a religious ceremony (for the rôle of the *oliva* in *sacra*, see Virgil *Georg.* 3.21, *Aen.* 5.774, and 6.808, and [Virgil] *Ciris* 148; the *vittae* are bands of wool which may be worn by priests (*OLD* s.v. *vitta* 2a),

attached to sacrificial victims (*OLD* s.v. 2b) or tied to sacred objects (*OLD* s.v. 2d)) but must also be apt to conceal the child. For this latter purpose neither salt-meal nor fruit, nor even heads of corn, are particularly appropriate. Nor will olive-branches alone do the job. What is required is the olive-tree's thick foliage (Juvenal 14.144 *densa . . . oliva*)—*frondibus*, parallel in construction to *ramis*, to which it is attached by *-que* (70 *et* adds a separate item, the *vittae*). Note that word-order represents the concealment of the child (*infantem*) among the leaves (*frondibus*) and branches (*ramisque*).

The corruption not only to *frugibus* but also to *frundibus* and *frodibus* (variant readings given by Gi and V respectively) can be explained if earlier in the tradition *frondibus* was written as *frūdibus* (cf. J.F. Heusinger (1774) 50, Ehwald intro. p. 21).

71 precantia verba:

Cf. Virgil *Aen.* 7.236–7 *ne temne, quod ultro/praeferimus manibus vittas ac verba precantia*, where both the words and the woollen ribbons are an indication of the Trojans' peaceful intentions.

73 vagitus:

The *vox propria* for the cries of a baby, *OLD* s.v. *vagitus* 'A cry of distress, a wail, howl (uttered by a baby, etc.)': there is no need to see our passage as echoing Lucretius 2.633–4 *Dictaeos . . . Curetas qui Iovis illum/vagitum in Creta quondam occultasse feruntur* (so Jacobson (1974) 165; however, his assertion that 87 may be seen in the light of Lucretius 5.226–7 is highly likely: see 87n.).

77–8:

Bömer (1969–1986) on *Met.* 5.604 remarks on the occurrence of Ovidian similes 'bei Höhepunkten' and 'als retardierendes Element'; Canace's similes perform both these tasks, accompanying the onset of Aeolus' fatal anger and delaying the narration of his cruel pronouncement (85–6). She compares her trembling with the effect of wind on the surface of the sea and on an ash-tree. The similes here draw on the similes to illustrate the trembling of the beloved in *Am.* 1.7:

exanimes artus et membra trementia vidi,
  ut cum populeas ventilat aura comas,
ut leni Zephyro gracilis vibratur harundo
  summave cum tepido stringitur unda Noto.
(*Am.* 1.7.53–6)

Ovid recasts and reuses that passage elsewhere in *Her.*: see 14.39–40n., and cf. 13.52n. In each of these instances, the reader may play the 'serious' cause of the trembling off against the more 'trivial' context of the *Am.* passage (cf. 14.39–40n.). Wind-similes are particularly appropriate in Canace's case, since the cause of her trembling is the lord of the winds himself.

78 tepido . . . Noto:
Heinsius cites as parallels *Am.* 1.4.12, 1.7.56, 2.8.20 and *Ibis* 34, and compares *Am.* 2.11.10 *egelidumque Notum.* Cf. *Ars* 3.174 *tepidus . . . Auster* and Seneca *Phaed.* 20 *tepidis austris.* McKeown (1989) on *Am.* 1.4.11–2 claims to have found only two pre-Ovidian occurrences of *tepidus* applied to winds: Catullus 64.282 *tepidi . . . Favonis* and [Tibullus] 3.4.96 *tepidos . . . Notos.* He also remarks on *tepidus* as an epithet for *Notus* in Ovid: while 'warm' is an appropriate designation for the South Wind (*OLD* s.v. *tepidus* 1b; note however Aristotle *Mete.* 364b where νότος is not merely warm but καυματώδης, = 'scorching'), *tepidus* is applied by Ovid to *Notus* as a rather hollow epithet, even in preference to a more appropriate adjective; McKeown cites *Am.* 2.8.20, 2.11.10 *egelidum* and [Tibullus] 3.4.96 as lines where some such adjective as *rapidus* (an exact metrical equivalent for *tepidus*) would have contributed more to the sense.

fraxina virga:
The poplar tree of *Am.* 1.7.54 and *Her.* 14.40 (see previous n.) here becomes an ash—an appropriate choice: being tall (Virgil *Georg.* 2.65–6 *ingens/fraxinus*), of flexible wood (Pliny *Nat.* 16.219 *cerasus firma, ulmus et fraxinus lentae, sed facile pandantur, flexiles tamen, stantesque ac circumcisura siccatae fideliores*), and with delicate leaves (see e.g. Bornecque-Prévost here: 'minces et oblongues, les feuilles de frêne n'opposent aucune résistance au vent'), it is particularly prone to trembling in the breeze. Furthermore, the ash-tree may provide us with two additional points of contact between Canace and the simile. Its bark, like that of the poplar (cf. 14.39–40n.), is pale grey, just as Canace herself is pale (79 *pallentia membra*); and, like the poplar, with which tree, among others, it is grouped at Virgil *Ecl.* 7.65–6 *fraxinus in silvis pulcherrima . . . populus in fluviis . . .*, the ash is attractive, and therefore suitably employed in a simile for a girl. Emendation of the paradosis *fraxina virga* (read by all of Dörrie's mss. save P prior to correction, which has the garbled *fraxincies virga*, and two others which, in giving

maxima virga and *flexina virga*, record the results of scribal unfamiliarity with *fraxina*) to a phrase that refers to another species of tree (thus T. Birt (1887) 852 *fagina virga*) is therefore undesirable.

Palmer, however, made a different sort of attack on the paradosis, and several subsequent editors followed. He objected to *fraxina* on the grounds that it is not given by the first hand of P (not a damning objection: see intro.), and that 'Ovid nowhere uses fraxinus as an adjective, nor does any Latin writer. Ovid uses fraxineus twice, Met. 5.9; 12.369'. He is the first in a series of editors who change *fraxina* (adj.) to *fraxinus* (noun), and conjecture in place of *virga* an agreeing adjective or participle (*icta* Palmer (1874), followed by Sedlmayer and Dörrie; *acta* is Sedlmayer's own conjecture, followed by Bornecque-Prévost; *alta* is tentatively suggested by Giomini, who nevertheless prefers the paradosis). The objection to *fraxina virga* was declared feeble by Housman (1899) 174 and by Giomini. Housman termed Palmer's unwillingness to accept a *hapax legomenon* here 'a characteristic specimen of levity assuming Rhadamanthine airs', and I am inclined to agree (contrast Knox). Palmer's assertion that whereas e.g. *faginus* (adj.) is 'correctly formed' *(faga + nus)*, *fraxinus* (adj.) is not, can equally be applied to *fraxineus* (attested by Ovid among others) in contrast with *fagineus*.

virga, disliked by Palmer ('tota arbor, non solum virga una, vento quatitur') and dismissed as a gloss by Dörrie, was defended by Giomini as synecdoche ('quantum ad verb. *virga* pertinet, causa non est cur disse ramus: perspicuam esse apud Ovidium synecdochen satis compertum habemus') and by Housman, in his review of Palmer, with characteristic wit ('this . . . cavil I throw back at *fraxinus icta*: tota silva, non solum arbor una, vento quatitur'). I suggest that *virga* constitutes not merely poetic synecdoche, but a deliberate choice of a part of the tree that responds readily to the movements of the breeze; and, moreover, it creates yet another subsidiary point of contact. Just as the shaking affects Canace's limbs (79 *membra*), so does the wind shake the 'limbs' of the tree. The choice of the ash-tree in a simile describing a trembling girl and the adjectival form *fraxina*, both unprecedented in extant literature, should be considered poetic innovation rather than grounds for emendation.

79 mea . . . pallentis:

More idiomatic than the paradosis *mea . . . pallentia* is *mea . . . pallentis*, Heinsius' conjecture: parallels for the not uncommon idiom whereby

a possessive adjective occurs in conjunction with a genitive adjective or participle describing the possessor can be found in Heinsius' note on 5.45 *et flesti et nostros vidisti flentis ocellos*; as well as uncontested examples he includes our line and 20.50 which he wishes to emend to *inque meo cupidi rapta ferere sinu.* The idiom is Greek as well as Latin: Heinsius cites Homer *Il.* 3.180 δαὴρ αὖτ' ἐμὸς ἔσκε κυνώπιδος and Sophocles *O.C.* 344 τἀμὰ δυστήνου κακά. McKeown (1989) on *Am.* 1.8.107–8 *saepe rogabis/ut mea defunctae molliter ossa cubent* adds Homer *Il.* 17.226, Sophocles *Tr.* 775, *Ph.* 1126, *O.C.* 344, Euripides *Andr.* 107 and Aristophanes *Ach.* 93.

Worth recording is *mihi . . . pallentia*, considered a possibility by Heinsius who found it in one of his mss. ('unus Regius' = Dörrie's Pa).

81–94:
Note the carefully controlled structure of the passage. Aeolus enters in a rage (81–2). Canace is powerless to speak (83–4). Aeolus makes his pronouncement (85–6). The child reacts (87–8). The pattern of self-contained couplets is now broken, as Canace attempts to convey her own state of mind (89–92). Aeolus leaves (93) and, after a strong pause at a third-foot caesura, Canace is free to vent her emotions (93–4). Aeolus' key actions—his entry into the bedchamber, his issuing of orders and his exit—are marked out by verbs placed in emphatic position at the start of the line (81 *inruit*, 86 *iusserat*, 93 *exierat*). These verbs, along with 81 *vulgat* and 82 *vix . . . continet*, each lack a stated subject: the reader's attention is focused on the actions themselves; the identity of the perpetrator is taken for granted (cf. 14.31–2n.).

Jacobson (1974) 166 remarks that 86 *iusserat* and 93 *exierat* are 'true' pluperfect tenses, not to be regarded as simply standing in for perfect or imperfect. He concedes that 'pluperfects were occasionally used as equivalent to perfect or imperfect', citing Platnauer *LEV* 112–4, but asserts that the 'effective and deliberate' deployment of pluperfect tenses here depicts the haste of Aeolus—at first sight, at any rate, a reasonable interpretation: before Canace knew what was happening, the orders had been issued, and then Aeolus had left (cf. 17–8 and 81 *inruit* for Aeolus' impetuosity). However, the poetic intention, if any, behind the choice of tense here is best considered in the light of similar uses of the pluperfect. *exierat thalamo* may be regarded as standing in place of a *cum* clause: the idiom is common

in Ovid, particularly as a closure to a speech (see Platnauer *LEV* 113 on *dixerat*, and note also *Fast.* 1.227 and *Met.* 2.103 *finierat monitus*; and *Am.* 3.1.61, *Fast.* 1.183, *Met.* 2.47, 4.167 and 8.725 *desierat*). Such phrases invariably create a strong mid-line pause (especially strong when, as often, the phrase is in asyndeton with what follows), marking off the end of a speech and delaying the reader before the description of the reaction. Thus here *exierat* closes the door on Aeolus, and anticipates Canace's delayed (*demum*) reaction. *iamque . . . iusserat* is particularly striking. *iam* + pluperfect tense is, especially in Ovid, a common scene-setting expression. Instances where the pluperfect is followed by a *cum* clause include *Fast.* 2.767–8, *Met.* 6.438ff., 7.234–6 and 11. 97–9 (all describe the passage of time); without an attendant *cum* clause, *Fast* 4.688 and 897, *Met* 3.50, 6.571 (describing the passage of time), *Her.* 21.87, *Fast.* 1.265, *Met.* 3.19, 9.646 and 11.474 (describing the completion of a (leg of a) journey). In each case the pluperfect verb gives a piece of background detail, subsidiary to the main action. This is a usual narrative convention (cf. the very common 'descriptive' pluperfect that describes an ongoing state, as e.g. 84 *torpuerat*), but the poet may use it to good effect: see *Ars* 1.683ff. where, with characteristic humour, Ovid renders the famous 'Judgement of Paris' as a scene setting-episode (683 *iam . . . dederat* and 685 *iam . . . venerat*; Hollis (1977) terms the passage 'a lightning summary of previous events, written in such a way that it assumes knowledge of the story on the part of the reader . . .'). Just as there an important but all too familiar episode is pushed into the background by means of the pluperfect tense, so here Canace's narration of Aeolus' issuing of orders, an action crucial to her situation but distressing to relate, is likewise relegated to background detail (cf. Knox, '. . . it is the baby's crying that O. draws our attention to').

81 nostrum vulgat . . . pudorem:
For Canace's concern with appearances, cf. 58. Her account of her father's anger is 'elliptical, to be sure' (Jacobson (1974) 168): he 'makes public our disgrace', *OLD* s.v. *pudor* 4 'A source of shame, dishonour, humiliation', perhaps referring here in concrete terms to the child. This passage concentrates on the actions that led to Canace's current situation (see previous n.); Canace is more concerned with her impending punishment than with its cause (cf. 23–6n.), allowing Ovid to skim over the details of a scene already familiar from Euripides *Aeolus* (cf. 69ff.n.)

82:
For similar descriptions in Ovid of anger bordering on violence see *Am.* 1.8.110–1 *at nostrae vix se continuere manus/quin . . .*, *Met.* 6.35 *vixque manum retinens*, 9.576 *vixque manus retinens trepidantis ab ore ministri*, and 13.203 *vix tenuere manus (scis hoc, Menelae) nefandas*; and cf. Seneca *Con.* 2.7.4 *in plagas deterrimi mancipi vix imbecillitatem muliebris manus continuit.*

83 ipsa nihil praeter lacrimas . . . profudi:
In contrast to the vociferous Aeolus (76 *insana regia voce sonat*, 81 *vulgat clamore*), it is no sound that issues forth from Canace, but tears: *profundo* can be used of either, *OLD* q.v. 2 '. . . to shed freely (blood, tears)'; s.v. 4 'To pour out in a stream (words, sound, etc.)'.

pudibunda:
pudibunda picks up 81 *pudorem.* The shame of the disclosure precipitates her tears. Contrast 56 where shame prevented her from crying. Scholars since Gellius have disagreed over the exact sense and tone of adjectives in *-bundus* (see the bibliography given by Harrison on Virgil *Aen.* 10.341), but a colloquial tone (cf. Knox, 'characteristic of less formal Latin') might be thought to suit the naïve and immature Canace.

85–6:
There has been much debate as to the extent to which infanticide was practised in the ancient world (Riddle (1992) 11 outlines the opposing sides); but that the exposure of children is a common element in myth is not in doubt (cf. e.g. L. Van Hook (1920) 137). For the detail of the lonely spot (*solis destituique locis*), see Sophocles *O.T.* 719 ἔρριψεν . . . εἰς ἄβατον ὄρος; and, for the abandoned child at the mercy of wild beasts, Euripides *Ph.* 1603 θηρσὶν ἄθλιον βοράν and Seneca *Phoen.* 255–6 *et in alta nemora pabulum misit feris/avibusque saevis.* The presence of these tragic elements here perhaps points towards the mention of the child's abandonment in Euripides *Aeolus.* However, the hyperbolic phrasing of *dari . . . canibusque avibusque* is surely Ovidian; only from the pentameter does it become clear that *dari* here means 'abandon'. It is no doubt this phrase that led A. Room (1990) s.v. *Canace* to state that 'her father . . . threw the child she had by her brother to the dogs'; cf. the illustration in Dryden (1680) that depicts dogs snapping at the nurse's feet as she carries the child past Aeolus.

87 sensisse putares:

A nice touch: the cries of the baby are represented by his mother as demonstrating possible understanding of his plight. See Palmer *ad loc.* The parenthesis arises out of the combination *vagitus . . . miser*, postulating a causal relationship between the two words.

Ovid will employ the motif (a version of the 'pathetic fallacy') again at *Fast.* 2.405 *vagierunt ambo pariter: sensisse putares!* of Romulus and Remus on their abandonment; and at 3.221–2 *et, quasi sentirent,/ blando clamore nepotes/tendebant ad avos bracchia parva suos* of the children of the Sabine women. In both instances, Ovid's is the only extant version of the myth to contain the observation that cries suggest awareness. One may therefore conclude that in the *Fasti* Ovid twice draws on the motif found here (cf. Knox, 'Ovid repeats the point in describing the exposure of Romulus and Remus at *Fast.* 2.405'). Certain details in the myth as Ovid found it would have been sufficient to remind the poet of this earlier line of his, and motivate the recurrences: at *Fast.* 2.405, the children's wailing (Dionysius of Halicarnassus *Antiquitates Romanae* 1.79.6 τὰ μὲν δὴ κνυζούμενα and Livy 1.4.6 *ad puerilem vagitum*; cf. Servius on Virgil *Aen.* 1.273 . . . *ad quos vagientes lupa . . . venit*), and at 3.221–3, the babies' role in winning over their grandfathers (Dionysius 2.45.5 τινὲς δὲ αὐτῶν καὶ τέκνα νήπια ἐπαγόμεναι; cf. Plutarch *Rom.* 19.2 αἱ μὲν παιδία κομίζουσαι νήπια πρὸς ταῖς ἀγκάλαις). Note *nepos* at line end at both *Her.* 11.85 and *Fast.* 3.221, and *avus suus* in hyperbaton at both 11.88 and 3.222.

Ovid is perhaps drawing on the philosophical *topos* where the cries of the newborn are imagined as demonstrating awareness of the toils that lie ahead. See esp. Lucretius 5.226–7 *vagituque locum lugubri complet, ut aequumst/cui tantum in vita restet transire malorum.* Although the *topos* is not confined to Lucretius, and indeed may be earlier (C.D.N. Costa (1984) there cites [Plato] *Axiochus* 366d),[9] it is Lucretius who is most likely to have been for Ovid here an 'unconscious [or even conscious] influence' (Jacobson (1974) 165): for the relationship between the two poets Jacobson (*loc. cit.*) directs his reader to Kenney (1958) 201–3.

[9] The work has widely been accepted as spurious; the date has been disputed. J.P. Hershbell (1981) 10–21 argues convincingly for some time in the second first centuries B.C.

The motif was appropriated by Statius at *Theb.* 8.156–7 (cited here by Palmer), with ingenuity in the change of context: *ipsique (putes sensisse) repugnant/cornipedes*, of the warhorses of Adrastus.

88 suum:

'The placement of *suum* in the relative clause disrupts the word-order and effectively represents Canace's distressed state of mind' (Knox). The hyperbaton is not particularly extravagant, especially not for Ovid: 'Ovid is often very licentious on this head', H.A.J. Munro (1886) on Lucretius 3.843–4; Munro produces there a list of striking hyperbata, which Housman (1890) 6–8 reproduces and augments. Nevertheless, the displaced *suum* deserves mention. It does not represent merely general confusion, as Knox suggests, but heightens the pathos by emphasizing that the baby's inarticulate pleas for its life are directed towards one of its own kin. For the displacement of an emphatic word from the main clause to a preceding relative clause, cf. e.g. 10.109–10 *illic tu silices, illic adamanta tulisti,/illic qui silices, Thesea, vincat, habes,* = 'In your breast (*illic*) you bore flint, there your bore adamant, there you have something to better flint:– Theseus' (i.e. 'your own hard heart'; Bornecque-Prévost and Verducci (1985) surprisingly translate *Thesea* as a vocative).

89 quid . . . animi:

For *quis* + partitive genitive in general, see e.g. Bömer (1969–1986) on *Met.* 13.482 *quid . . . cruoris* and on 14.177 *quid . . . animi.* Examples of *quid animi* in particular are to be found in Heinsius' note on *Met.* 1.358–9 where, following 'unus Vossianus et unus meus cum Naugerii codice et margine editionis Gryphianae', he prefers *quid tibi . . . nunc animi, miseranda, foret?* to the *quis . . . animus* of the majority tradition. From Ovid he cites *Met.* 5.626, 7.582, 14.177 and [Ovid] *Nux* 167; also *Trist.* 3.3.5 *quid . . . animi*, a variant from the paradosis *quem . . . animum.* Cf. *quid mentis*, found in Ovid at *Her* 7.66 and *Ars* 3.713.

The idiom is early: among Heinsius' examples of *quid animi* are Ennius *Sat.* fr. 18 Vahlen[3], Cato fr. 58 Malcovati[2], and Caesar *Gal.* 7.77.8.

germane:

According to the ancient grammarians, *germanus* and *germana* are more specific terms than *frater* and *soror*, referring exclusively to siblings with both parents in common. See Knox, who cites *TLL* s.v. *germanus*

1914.40ff. If Ovid makes the same distinction, one might conclude that he is here alluding to the tradition that makes Aeolus and Amphothea the parents of both Macareus and Canace (pseudo-Plutarch *Moral.* 312C and Stobaeus 4.20.72).

It appears, however, that on this point as on others (cf. e.g. 18n. *possidet et*) the grammarians and the classical poets do not agree. The latter employ *germanus/a* not only where the exact relationship between the siblings is not an issue, but even where the mythical tradition posits for them only one common parent: see e.g. Virgil *Aen.* 5.412 *germanus* of Aeneas' half-brother Eryx (on their respecitve parentages, see W.H. Roscher (1884–1937) s.v. *Aeneas* 157.41ff. and s.v. *Eryx* 1385.20ff.); Ovid *Her.* 9.155 *germanus* used of Tydeus (Roscher q.v. 1388.20ff.) by Deianira (Roscher q.v. 976.15ff.); and Seneca *Her. O.* 278–9 *Iole meis captiva germanos dabit/natis*, where immediate context allows to *germanos* no meaning other than 'step-brothers'.

In Virgil, the only recognisable distinction between *germanus/a* and *frater/soror* is a stylistic one: of twenty-two occurrences of the former, twenty-one are in the *Aeneid.* That the sole other example (*Georg.* 4.377) appears in a passage that has been noted for its Homeric content and grand vocabulary (B. Otis (1964) pp. 194f., R.F. Thomas (1988), and R.A.B. Mynors (1990)) is telling.

Broadly speaking, Ovid took on board this Virgilian point of style, as a survey of the frequency of *germanus/a* in each work demonstrates:

Am. and *Ars*	one occurrence each (*Am.* 2.5.25, *Ars* 3.336).
Her.:	eight occurrences (5.113, 6.159, 9.7, 9.155, 9.165, 11.89, 12.115, 14.54).
Fast.:	three occurrences (3.560, 4.53, 6.17).
Met.:	fifteen occurrences (2.803, 5.13, 6.444, 6.523, 6.564, 6.582 (contested), 6.598, 6.613, 7.51, 8.242, 8.475, 8.778, 9.382, 9.510, 12.240).

Cf. Bömer (1969–1986) on *Met.* 5.13: 'Das Wort [*germanus*] hat für Ovid trotz des seltenen Vorkommens in den Met. (nur noch XII 240) [the other examples I cite above are accounted for by *germana*] durch Virgil einen gewissen color epicus'. In addition, Ovid appears to make particular use of a nuance of meaning already present in *germanus* and *germana* (cf. the use in earlier writers of the adjective *germanus* as a synonym for *carus/dilectus*, *TLL.* s.v. *germanus* 1916.40ff.): the two words are employed by Ovid in apostrophes where a close bond is invoked. Note Procne's pledge to her sister that she will avenge her against Tereus, *Met.* 6.613 '*in omne nefas ego me, germana,*

paravi'; Cepheus' plea that his brother put down the spear aimed at Perseus, *Met.* 5.13–4 *'quid facis?' exclamat, 'quae te, germane, furentem/mens agit in facinus?'*; Dryope's farewell to her immediate family, among whom is the sister narrating the tale, *Met.* 9.382 *'care vale coniunx et tu, germana, paterque'* In the light of this, Medea's apostrophe of the brother she murdered, *Her.* 12.115 *at non te fugiens sine me, germane, reliqui* seems particularly poignant. The nuance is hard to pin down: at *Her.* 9.165–6 the occurrence of *germana* alongside *frater* suggests that the former is simply a synonym for *soror.* Without the context of an apostrophe, *germanus/a* often appears to stand in for *frater/soror.* Procris and Philomela, e.g., are designated with both terms. Nevertheless, Canace's apostrophe of her *germanus,* when elsewhere in the epistle the two are *soror* and *frater* (7, 25, 26, 61, 63, 123), may be deliberate, given that in this couplet Canace characterizes Macareus' state of mind as parallel to her own.

90 nam:

The logic of the connective is not obvious. The ms. alternatives *iam* and *et* may indicate scribal confusion. U. von Wilamowitz-Möllendorf (1935–1962) 5.2.57–8 prefers a conjecture of his own, the rather grotesque *non* ('you cannot imagine how I felt'): for Canace to claim her addressee incapable of answering her question even before she has finished asking it would be perverse; furthermore, *germane* in the line above suggests shared experience between the parents rather than feelings exclusive to the mother.

Not uncommonly the logical context which *nam* requires in order to exert its usual explanatory (*OLD* q.v. 2) or causal (*OLD* q.v. 3) force is not expressed. German grammarians and commentators term such instances of *nam* 'anknüpfend' (= 'tying-on'): see e.g. H-S 505 'Anknüpfendes und adversatives nam'; Bömer (1969–1986) on *Met.* 2.329 *nam* 'rein anknüpfend', on *Met.* 3.168 *nam* 'anknüpfend, etwa i.q. "δε"', on *Met.* 15.487 *nam* 'anknüpfend', etc., etc. However, it is often preferable to consider *nam* on these occassions not as wholly devoid of any causal force, practically a synonym for *et* or *sed* (or rather, as Bömer remarks, for δέ), but as dependent on an idea in ellipse. Thus, at *Met.* 2.325–9 *Naides Hesperiae trifida fumantia flamma/corpora* [i.e. of Phaëthon] *dant tumulo, signant quoque carmine saxum:/*[the following two lines give the inscription]/*nam pater obductos luctu miserabilis aegro/condiderat vultus,* the *nam* depends on some such unexpressed idea as 'the nymphs and not his father performed the obsequies'.

Cf. also e.g. *Met.* 11.411–4 . . . *Ceyx,/consulat ut sacras, hominum oblectamina, sortes/ad Clarium parat ire deum; nam templa profanus/invia cum Phlegyis faciebat Delphica Phorbas*, with G.M.H. Murphy *ad loc.*, 'the thought connection is "he did not got to the (more famous [and nearer by]) oracle at Delphi, for . . ."'. At *Met.* 14.741–2 *exclamant famuli frustraque levatum* [sc. *Iphin*]*/(nam pater occiderat) referunt ad limina matris*, the thought in ellipse ('the house to which they took him belonged to his mother and not, as might have been expected, to his father') is easily interpolated from what follows the parenthesis, *referunt ad limina matris.*

In our line, one may consider *nam* as 'anknüpfend', or else as dependent on a thought in ellipse ('you know that I was distraught', or sim.). This second interpretation is preferable: the unexpressed idea is readily supplied as an answer to Canace's rhetorical question (see Jacobson (1974) 171, 'The question is rhetorical (= you know how I feel) and on this the nam depends'). Cf. *Trist.* 3.7.11–4 *'tu quoque' dic 'studiis communibus ecquid inhaeres,/doctaque non patrio carmina more canis?/nam tibi cum facie mores natura pudicos/et raras dotes ingeniumque dedit'*, where the sentence introduced by *nam* presupposes an answer to the preceding question.

The couplet 89–90 expresses the enormity of Canace's distress without describing it. Only her fellow-sufferer can comprehend her torment.

91 inimicus:

According to Knox, this 'enemy' who carries the child off into the wilds to be exposed is Aeolus himself; the attempts of Bentley and Palmer to avoid such a designation, the former by emendation to *immitis*, the latter by asserting that the *inimicus* is one of Aeolus' lackeys, are attributed by Knox to a wrongheaded objection that Canace would not use so harsh a term of her father. Indeed, such an objection would carry little weight: as Knox points out, 'Canace's feelings toward her father are not gentle'.

Nevertheless, the *inimicus* is not Aeolus. My objections lie (as, I suspect, did Palmer's) elsewhere. One need not speculate, as one might, that the actual task of exposing a child is not the business of a king (in the Oedipus myth, for example, that duty is assigned to a shepherd). Our narrator is explicit: Aeolus has given the order (85–6), and one expects it to be carried out. Moreover, the formu-

laic *exierat thalamo* in line 93 (cf. 81–94n.) is clumsily redundant if Aeolus has already departed with the baby (*mea . . . viscera . . . ferret*) in 91–2. Lines 89–92 represent an advance in the story: a servant has arrived in response to Aeolus' command. According to his daughter's representation, Aeolus is high-handed and imperious: note lines 15–8, and the presence of a further servant to carry out his harsh will at 95ff. The *inimicus* (he earns the appellation by association) who responds to his lord's command so quickly and predictably that his arrival is not narrated constitutes a fine addition to this characterisation; he stands in stark contrast to the usual friendly rescuer of exposed children in mythology.

92 viscera:
viscera as an emotive term for a child (cf. the English 'my own flesh and blood') is an extension of *viscera* = 'womb' (44n.). Ovid is fond of this usage. In addition to the Ovidian examples cited by Palmer on 1.90 and Knox here (*Am.* 2.14.27, *Rem.* 59, *Met.* 6.651, 8.478, 10.465, *Trist.* 1.7.20 *viscera nostra* of Ovid's poems, his 'children'), see *Met.* 5.18–9 . . . *quae visceribus veniebat belua ponti/exsaturanda meis* of Andromeda, and perhaps also *Fast.* 6.137 *carpere dicuntur lactentia viscera rostris* of the infants devoured by screech-owls. Cf. the Greek σπλάγχνα, used not only of the womb (e.g. Pindar *O.* 6.43) but also of offspring (Artemidorus *Oneirocritica* 1.44 and 5.57).

In our line, as at *Met.* 5.18, 6.651 and *Fast.* 6.137 the choice of word may have been suggested not only by the 'charged context' (Knox), but because in each case the child provides flesh for feeding upon (Canace's child for mountain wolves, Andromeda for the sea-monster, Itys for his father Tereus, the nurslings for the screech-owls): for *viscus* = 'meat', see *OLD* q.v. 1b.

93–4:
Canace is now alone and, having previously had recourse only to tears (83), finally free to beat her breast and tear at herself in a display of emotion. Contrast Ariadne and, in the *Met.*, Myrrha's nurse, who both fall freely to beating their breasts (*Her.* 10.37 *plangore replebam*, *Met.* 10.386 *seque ferit scinditque sinus*) but delay tears until a more appropriate moment: Ariadne weeps (*Her.* 10.43 *tum denique flevi*) only after she has made every attempt to call the departing Theseus back (33–42) and when his ship is out of sight (43 *iamque oculis ereptas eras*);

Myrrha's nurse (*Met.* 10.387 *tum denique flere vacavit*) only when she has removed the noose from the neck of her ward (386–7 *ereptaque collo/vincula dilaniat*).

In the case of Ariadne, it is likely that Ovid introduces this element of delay in order to create variation from a famous earlier treatment. Catullus' Ariadne, in contrast with Ovid's, weeps (if that is the sense of Catullus 64.60 *maestis ocellis*) while Theseus is in sight, and continues to weep (131 *udo ore*) as she laments. Cf. Jacobson (1974) 217–8, 'One wonders whether the bizzare description of Ariadne standing on the shore, shouting, waving arms, raising "semaphores" (37–42) is a deliberate antithesis to Catullus' heroine who perforce must stand on the shore watching Theseus sail away and do nothing whatsoever (61–7)'.

So too, perhaps, in our passage. That Canace holds back her display of grief until she is alone may stem from a speech delivered to Aeolus (or to the chorus) in Euripides' play.

93 tunc demum:
Not the reading of all the mss. According to Dörrie, nine read *tum* (according to Giomini, *tum* is also the reading *post correctionem* of G), and *denique* rather than *demum* is given by one thirteenth century ms. (Bi).

Some scholars attempt to make a distinction between *tum* and *tunc*: e.g. Lewis-Short s.v. *tunc*, esp. 'In general, *tunc* is not freq. until after the Augustan period'. I remain unconvinced that one can rely heavily on ms. evidence for any such a distinction; cf. Lewis-Short's concession, ibid., 'The codd. very freq. vary between the words [*tum* and *tunc*], and in many passages the reading is still doubtful'. Certainly, the mss. for the *Heroides* often disagree on this matter, nor is there any discernable pattern to their allegiances. Even where the mss. are unanimous in their choice of *tum* or *tunc*, they hold no unquestionable authority. The corruption *tum*)(*tunc* may have occurred in such cases very early on in the tradition. Such a corruption involves very little change, particularly where abbreviations are used: for t' and t̓ as abbreviations for *tum*, see Lindsay (1915) 310 and 358f.; for t̔ as an abbreviation for *tunc*, see Lindsay 158ff. Only metre can champion the one over the other: thus at *Her.* 11.89, 12.5, 16.321 and 323, 17.105 and 18.210 *tum* will not scan. It is helpful for editors to adopt a convention: so Dörrie, who prints the sole or majority reading (which is always also the reading of P), with one exception:

where the word is immediately followed by *cum*, he prints *tum* (thus at 1.5 he prints *O utinam tum, cum* . . ., though supported by only four of his mss.). In the present edition, *tum* is printed in preference, except where it is unmetrical. However, one ought not to claim that any such convention necessarily represents what the poet wrote.

In distinguishing between *demum* and *denique*, the mss. may be more useful. Metre will not make such a distinction here, nor will meaning. *tum/tunc demum* and *tum/tunc denique* are both firmly paralleled: at *Fast.* 4.615 and *Met.* 9.413 the correct reading is *tum/tunc demum*, since *denique* will not scan; while at *Her.* 10.43, *Fast.* 1.449, 3.223, 3.235, *Met.* 3.629, 5.34, 7.86, 8.586, 9.60 and 11.18 *tum/tunc denique* is likely to be correct, since *demum* would give a fifth-foot spondee.

Provided that the reports of the editors are to be trusted, the ms. evidence points towards *demum* as the correct reading here. As far as is possible to discern, the mss. for the works of Ovid do not readily confuse *demum* and *denique*: where one of the two words does not scan, no ms. reads it, and where *demum* would produce a fifth-foot spondee, *demum* is given by no mss. Furthermore, that no mss. read *demum* at the first foot of the hexameter[10] is also suggestive of their reliability: on Ovid's preference for dactylic hexameter openings, see Platnauer *LEV* 38.

One might therefore take the testimony of the mss. into account when, as here, *demum* and *denique* are equally metrical. On such occasions, either all mss. give *denique* (so at *Her.* 12.107, *Met.* 4.519, 5.210, 7.857, 10.664), or else most give *demum*, with *denique* as a minority reading (so here and at *Met.* 13.391; on one occasion only, at *Met.* 10.387, most mss. have *denique* and *demum* is found as a minor variant). It seems a reasonable, although not forgone conclusion that where the mss. agree unanimously on *denique*, *denique* should be allowed to stand; and that where *demum* appears in the paradosis, it should be regarded not as a corruption (for it would be odd if *denique* had been corrupted almost universally on two occasions, and remained uncorrupted on six) but as the true reading. *denique* in the minority tradition is a result of corruption through familiarisation.

[10] *denique* opens the hexameter at *Am.* 1.7.43, 2.4.47, *Her.* 1.21, 2.21, 4.84, 5.89, 15.102, 20.67, *Fast.* 2.29, 3.149, *Met.* 2.95, 4.361, 5.436, 9.626, 14.652, *Trist.* 1.1.49, 1.3.61, 1.5.81, 1.8.23, 2.323, 2.361, 2.495 (possibly corrupt), 3.5.43, 4.9.15, 5.1.75, 5.4.22, 5.12.37, *Pont.* 1.1.27, 1.2.107, 2.1.11, 2.4.21, 2.8.63, 3.9.47, *Ibis* 155 and 635.

pectora plangi:
The combination *pectus plangere*, especially common in Ovid (cf. Knox on 5.71 *pectora planxi*) often occurs with the two words juxtaposed, as here (see also *Am.* 2.6.3, *Her.* 5.71, *Fast.* 1.578, 4.896, *Met.* 6.248 and 13.491; non-Ovidian examples include Propertius 2.24.52 *plangas pectora nuda*, and Statius *Silv.* 3.5.53 *ingentes iterasti pectore planctus*; cf. *Silv.* 5.1.179–80 *saevo ne concute planctu/pectora*). Such juxtaposition doubtless owes as much to the resultant onomatopoeic phrase as to metrical convenience. On Ovidian alliteration of 'p' see e.g. W.F. Jackson Knight (1958) 116.

The mss. divide between *pectora planxi* (cf. Planudes' το στέρνον ἐπάταξα) and *pectora plangi*. Cf. 15.113 4, where F, the chief ms. for that epistle, gives *nec pectora plangi/nec puduit scissis exululare comis*, while the vulgate tradition gives *nec/tunc/mea pectora planxi*. . . . There, *planxi* is likely to be a corruption of *plangi* (Dörrie (1975) 138). So too in our passage, where there is a strong argument against *planxit/contigit inque*: as an example of a postponed enclitic in the first half of the pentameter, Platnauer *LEV* 92 found only Propertius 4.8.44 *reccidit inque suos mensa supina pedes*.

In our line, all edd. except Giomini print *pectora plangi*, rightly (Dörrie's *pectore plangi* is doubtless a misprint). This is not accusative and infinitive, but 'middle' or 'reflexive' infinitive with *pectora* the object of the 'middle' verb: 'it fell (to me) to beat my breast and to. . . .' For *plangor* + direct object there is no firm parallel (15.113 has been suspected as an interpolation, and even as evidence against Ovidian authorship of that epistle: see Palmer, Knox, Tarrant (1981) 138); but for *plangor* = 'strike oneself', see *Met.* 5.675, 8.528, and 11.75 [*volucris*] *plangitur* where Bömer (1969–1986) paraphrases '"schlägt sich selbst (mit den Flügeln)", "flattert"'. For 'middle' verbs taking a direct object, cf. 14.51n.

94 genas:
The mss. divide fairly evenly between *comas* and *genas*: according to Dörrie, sixteen give the former; nineteen, including a correcting hand in P (P's original reading is in erasure) give the latter (two mss., K and Mi, transpose *meas* and *genas*). Planudes' mss. all give τὴν . . . κόμην. Such ms. confusion is not uncommon where, at first appearance at any rate, context admits of both 'hair' and 'cheeks': Heinsius here cites *Her.* 5.72, Statius *Ach.* 1.77, Claudian *de Rapt.* 3.177 and Silius Italicus 2.560 as lines where the paradosis includes both *coma* and

gena; in each case, as here, the line concerns self-mutilation as an expression of distress. Cf. similar confusion at *Her.* 5.68. In our line, context favours *genas*, followed by several edd. including Bornecque-Prévost, Showerman-Goold, and Knox. Cf. Burman, '*genas* hic praeferrem, quia, rectius dicitur *ire unguibus in genas*, quam *comas*', a valid point. At *Am.* 3.6.48 *ungue notata comas, ungue notata genas*, the phrase *ungue notata comas* takes its meaning from the parallel phrase *ungue notata genas*; similarly at Statius *Theb.* 6.624–5 *nunc ora indigna cruento/ungue secat meritamque comam*, the phrase *cruento/ungue secat* applies more strictly to *ora* than to *comam*. For the *unguis* deployed only on the *comae* there exists no example. An attack on the face with the *unguis*, however, is well supported: examples which incorporate *eo in* (*OLD* s.v. *eo* 7 'To go with hostile intent, go for (a person)', *TLL* q.v. 634.53ff.) include *Am.* 1.7.64 *protinus in vultus unguibus ire meos*, 2.5.46 *et fuit in teneras impetus ire genas*, Valerius Flaccus 7.294 *iret in ora deae* and 8.150–2 *vellem unguibus uncis/ut volucris possem praedonis in ipsius ora/ire.*

95 patrius vultu maerente satelles:
The word-order marks out the tension: though the attendant of Aeolus (*patrius . . . satelles*), the messenger wears an expression (*vultu maerente*) which suggests that his sympathies lie with Canace—according to Canace's own representation at any rate. The epistolary form, combined with our ignorance of how the attendant's Euripidean counterpart behaved, prevents us from judging whether his sad countenance is 'fact' or wishful thinking ('projection'—cf. 13.135ff.n.) on Canace's part. See Jacobson (1974) 350.

For the meaning of *satelles* (= 'henchman') see *OLD* q.v. 1. Given that the word is not common in Ovid (only at *Fast.* 5.538 and *Met.* 14.354), its application here to one who is not only the attendant of the wind-king but perhaps also himself a wind (if he is one of the *populus* mentioned at 14) may owe something to Plautus *Trin.* 833, where the winds are the *satellites* of Neptune.

96 indignos:
= 'shameful', *OLD* s.v. *indignus* 6 (so e.g. Palmer and Knox); or, perhaps better, 'unworthy (sc. of himself)', *OLD* q.v. 5 'Beneath the character or dignity (of), unbecoming or unworthy (of)'. Cf. *Am.* 3.6.72, of Ilia, *edidit indignos ore tremente sonos* (cited by Knox), where *indignos* cannot carry the sense 'shameful': see G. Némethy (1907) *ad*

loc., '*indignos*, quia innocens erat neque digna, quae tam flebiles sonos ederit'. *indignos . . . sonos* in our line, like *vultu maerente* in the hexameter (previous n.), dissociates the *satelles* from the orders he conveys. Canace, it seems, has no wish to shoot the messenger.

Planudes, who elsewhere (5.8, 16.215) translates *indignus* as ἀνάξιος/-ως, here renders *indignos . . . sonos* with ἀγανακτήσεως . . . φθογγὴν, = 'words conveying displeasure', a sense that would clash strongly with *vultu maerente.* Either he has wrongly considered *indignus* a synonym for *indignans* (see Palmer intro. pp. 47–8 on Planudes' shortcomings), or else, less likely, the ms. from which he was translating exhibited a corrupt reading (e.g. *indignans*).

97–8:
The sword is given by Aeolus to his daughter via an intermediary, and is accompanied not so much by an order to commit suicide as by a strong hint ('he bids you know from your offence what it means', 98). Both these features of the story appear to have been present in Sostratus *Tyrrhenica* (Pseudo-Plutarch *Moralia* 312c = *Parallel. Min.* 28a τεκοῦσα δὲ καὶ ξίφους πεμφθέντος ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρός, ἄνομον κρὶνασα ἑαυτὴν χρήσατο, Stobaeus 4.20.72 Αἴολος δὲ περὶ τούτων μαθὼν τῇ θυγατρὶ ζίφος ἔπεμψεν· ἡ δὲ ὡς νόμον δεξαμένη τὸν σίδηρον αὐτὴν ἀνεῖλε; for their relationship to Sostratus cf. 27n.), and are also likely to have been present in Euripides *Aeolus*: they put one in mind of the actions taken, particularly by characters in tragedy, to avoid the μιάσμα incurred by those who inflict capital punishment: see R. Parker (1982) 133, and R.C. Jebb (1888) on Sophocles *Antigone* 775 ὡς ἄγος μόνον (the phrase may be corrupt), where Creon provides the imprisoned Antigone with just enough food to avoid bringing pollution on himself.

hunc ensem . . . tradidit ensem . . . iste:
The poet marks out the handing-over of the sword. The narrator's parenthetical interruption, with repetition of *ensem*, lends gravitas to the crucial moment. See Austin (1977) on Virgil *Aen.* 6.406–7 *'at ramum hunc' (aperit ramum qui veste latebat)/'agnoscas'*, 'an ingenious parenthesis, investing the crucial moment with high drama. The repetition of *ramum* adds to its significance'. He notes that 'it is a device much used by Ovid', and quotes, among others, our line, which is meticulously categorised by M. v. Albrecht (1964) 109–10. Elsewhere, Ovid uses such 'epic' parentheses to humorous effect, the humour

being derived from either the lowly context (e.g. *Met.* 1.590–1, of Jupiter's attempt to seduce Io, *'pete' dixerat 'umbras/altorum nemorum' (et nemorum monstraverat umbras)*) or the provision of information that can readily be inferred from what precedes (e.g. *Met.* 5.281–2 *'nec dubitate, precor, tecto grave sidus et imbrem'/(imber erat) 'vitare meo'*). L.P. Wilkinson (1958) 235 terms both these examples 'additions of information with the nuance "as I should have mentioned before"'. The parenthesis in our line is rather closer in tone to its epic model. Indeed, it may even draw directly on *Aen.* 6.406, a line that appears to have been well-known, at any rate to the anonymous author of the *Ciris*: see [Virgil] *Ciris* 280–1 *'aut ferro hoc' (aperit ferrum quod veste latebat)/'purpureum patris dempsissem vertice crinem'*, 'an almost certain adaption of Verg. *Aen.* 6.406', Lyne (1978) *ad loc.*

Parenthesis in this sedes (v. Albrecht 35, category 6a) is rare in Ovid: in the *Heroides* cf. only 6.105 *non probat Alcimede mater tua—consule matrem!*—and 8.97 *obvia prodieram reduci tibi—vera fatebor*—; and in the *Metamorphoses* only 10.408 *'sensimus' 'inquit 'amas; et in hoc mea (pone timorem)/sedulitas erit apta tibi'.* In each case, coincidence of metrical ictus and word-stress underlines the emotive phrase.

The attendant's designation of the sword, once handed over, as *iste* is well chosen. The reading of three of Dörrie's MSS., *quid ipse velit* (= 'what is his, i.e. Aeolus', will') is a clear corruption. Now in Canace's hands, the sword is hers: with *iste* the henchman clears from himself any association with the instrument of death. See e.g. K-S 1.621 '*iste* wird oft da angewendet, wo mit Verachtung auf einen Gegenstand hingedeutet wird'.

100 pectoribus condam:

= 'I will bury in my chest'. For *condo* of plunging a weapon into its target, see *TLL* q.v. 150.67ff. and *OLD* q.v. 7b. Ovidian examples are: (+ ablative, as here) *Met.* 12.453–4, 13.458–9, and *Ibis* 540; (+ *in* + ablative) *Met.* 1.726–7; (+ *in* + accusative) *Met.* 8.419, 12.294–5, 13.391–2, and 13.561.

In our line, however, the object of *condam*, *dona paterna*, suggests an additional meaning. For (*in*) *pectore condo* = 'take to heart', see Plautus *Ps.* 575 *meo in pectore conditumst consilium* and 941 *omnia in pectore condita sunt*, Seneca *Tro.* 580 *pectore imo condita arcana*, and cf. Apuleius *Met.* 11.25 *divinos tuos vultus numenque sanctissimum intra pectoris mei secreta conditum.* This type of usage for *condo* was not unknown to Ovid: see *Her.* 20.100 *vocem memori condidit aure tuam.* Canace will

take her father's gift to heart, both metaphorically, by acting upon his orders (for *condo* of commiting orders to memory, see Catullus 64.231–2 *tum vero facito ut memori tibi condita corde/haec vigeant mandata*), and literally, by burying the sword in her chest. Dryden (1680) seems to have noticed the *double entendre*: 'Too well I know the Sense these Words impart:/His *Present* [his italics] shall be treasur'd in my Heart'.

101 mea . . . conubia:
See Knox on 2.81 for the poetic lengthening of the naturally short *u* of *conubia*.

Canace refers to her own wedding (101–6), then to those of her sisters (107–8). Scholars divide between those who discern here a reference to the 'marriage-lottery' referred to in the hypothesis of Euripides *Aeolus*, ὁ δὲ συνκα[λεσά-/μενος κλῆρον τοῦ γάμου πᾶσιν ἐξέθῆκεν (so H. Lloyd-Jones (1963) 443, followed by Garvie (1969) 170 and Knox on 101 and 105) and those who deem Canace's references to marriage as rather more vague and unmotivated (so Jacobson (1974) 161, Verducci (1985) 221–2).

Ovid's Canace knows nothing of any plans to marry Aeolus' daughters to his sons. She has only Macareus' unexplained assurance that the two of them will marry (63–4). Cf. Williams (1992) 204, 'There is no need to infer from lines 101–8 that Canace has knowledge of the marriage-arrangement which Macareus makes with Aeolus'. The mention of marriage is, however, unforced, arising out of 100 *dona paterna*, and motivated by her marriageable age and Macareus' promise. In imagining the sword as her dowry, she touches upon the *topos* of death as marriage (see e.g. R. Seaford (1987) 106–7, R. Rehm (1994); that the motif belongs especially to tragedy, combined with the fact that Ovid here gives it only a cursory treatment, may indicate that it had already been in the mouth of Euripides' Canace), and thence moves to an equally familiar motif, the failed wedding-ceremony (cf. e.g. 14.27–8, 21.157ff.).

Ovid's reader, however, who knows not only of the marriage-lottery but also that it is only Canace's ignorance of her father's pardon that will cause her to die unmarried, notes the tragic irony (see intro.).

muneribus . . . conubia donas:
Burman expressed doubts concerning this phrase ('dubito valde, an latine dicatur, aut sit pro Ovidiana elegantia'), and conjectured *dotas*,

'quod sequentia confirmant', citing *Met.* 13.523 *at, puto, funeribus dotabere, regia virgo* and noting that some mss. there give the corrupt *donabere.*

There is no reason to doubt *donas* here: for *dono* + accusative + ablative = 'I endow x with y', see *OLD* s.v. dono 1 (where our line is cited under the subheading '*poet.*') and *TLL* q.v. 2010.6ff. (examples of endowing with a *munus* are given at 2011.6ff.). The idiom is common, nor does Ovid avoid it: for *dono* + accusative of person + ablative of thing, see *Ars* 2.261 (where, however, Burman favours over *dones* the reading of one of his mss., *dites* (= 'enrich', see *OLD* s.v. *dito*), which at least deserves a place in the apparatus of future editions), *Fast.* 6.217, *Trist.* 4.8.24; and for *dono* + accusative of thing + ablative of thing, as here, see *Ars* 2.3 and *Fast.* 5.103. Burman's *dotas,* while adequately paralleled (in addition to *Met.* 13.523 see *Her.* 6.137–8), would work against the rhetoric of our passage. The repetition *dotas?* . . . *dote,* while not in itself problematic (see H.D. Naylor (1907) on the frequency of apparently colourless repetition in the *Heroides,* and J. Wills (1996) 473ff. for a general discussion; and Wills 328 on Ovid's penchant for resumption of a verb by a cognate noun), would destroy the three-stage thought-progression from the vague *dona paterna,* through a reference to wedding-gifts (101), to the specific mention of the dowry (*dote*). Moreover, *dote* picks up *muneribus* in the hexameter and thereby contributes to the internal symmetry of the couplet (*hac* corresponds in sense and position with *his, tua* with *mea, dote* with *muneribus, pater* with *genitor*): the verbal correspondance between *dote* and *dotes* would detract from this symmetry.

103–6:

The thought that Canace is to have a funeral in place of a wedding finds expression through the contrast between marriage torch (103–4), *OLD* s.v. *fax* 2a, and funeral torch (105–6), *OLD* q.v. 2b—a common motif: cf. e.g. 6.41–2, with Knox *ad loc.* In our passage, Ovid adapts the picture of the Fury who holds the torch at a doomed wedding (thus at e.g. 6.45–6 and *Met.* 6.428–30; in both cases she stands in for the gods who preside at more auspicious marriages) to suit Canace's case. The Furies take the place of Hymen, not to perform his task of carrying the wedding torch—for there will be no wedding, not even an ill-omened one—, but to light the funeral pyre (106). They supply for that job their own torches (105). The *fax* is a standard element of the Furies' accoutrements, especially in

iconography: see e.g. *LIMC* s.v. *Erinys passim.* In *LIMC* loc. cit. 9, 45 and 72 the Fury is clearly depicted as brandishing her torch as a weapon: cf. *ferte faces in me* here (105), with *OLD* s.v. *fero* 15b 'to bring (a weapon) to bear (on), thrust (at); to deal (a blow).'

The symmetrical structure established in the couplet 101–2 (101n. *muneribus . . . conubia donas*) is, to a large extent, sustained here: the content of 105–6 corresponds and contrasts with that of 103–4; and one might argue that the more specific echoes (103 *faces,* 105 *faces*; 103 *tolle* at verse-beginning, 105 *ferte* at verse-beginning; 103 *Hymenaee* after a strong fourth-foot caesura, 105 *Erinyes* after a weak fourth-foot caesura) are sufficient to tilt the balance in favour of the reading *et* as first word of 106 (cf. *et* as first word of 104), against *ut,* also attested, and the conjecture *ac* printed by Riese, Merkel and Sedlmayer; and in favour of the conjecture *atras* over the paradosis *atrae* in 105 (see n.).

In his depiction of a funeral in place of a wedding, Ovid, who turned his own hand to the composition of a marriage song at the wedding of Paullus Fabius Maximus (see *Pont.* 1.2.131–2), adapts motifs from the epithalamium. Thus Hymenaeus holds the marriage torch (cf. e.g. Catullus 61.14–5 with Fordyce (1961) *ad loc.*, and Seneca *Med.* 67 and 110–2), and the order he receives, *tolle procul . . . faces,* is reminiscent of the order given by Catullus to the male attendants at 61.114 to raise their torches to the bride, *tollite, <o> pueri, faces*; Hymenaeus, however, is not to 'raise' the torches (*OLD* s.v. *tollo* 3), but to 'take them away' (*OLD* qv. 10). The addition of *procul* points towards the correct sense for *tollo* in our passage. Similarly, 103–4 *Hymenaee . . . fuge* may be regarded as a negation of the wedding cry which calls on the god to be present: cf. e.g. the refrain of Catullus 62 *Hymen o Hymenaee, Hymen ades o Hymenaee*; Knox cites 61.9–10 *huc veni, niveo gerens/luteum pede soccum,* where the mention of the wedding-god's *pes* is tantalizing (cf. 104 *turbato . . . pede*). The repetition of 105, *ferte faces . . . quas fertis,* may represent a feature of wedding-song: see Catullus 61.197 *quod cupis cupis* (where, however, P. Fedeli (1972) 128–9 noted that such a 'ripetizione paronomastica' is 'propria della lingua parlata,' and particularly at home in comedy).

106 is a further adaption, not of epithalamia but of elegy. The echo of Tibullus 1.1.6 is, as Knox observed, 'unmistakable':

> dum meus assiduo luceat igne focus.

One ms. there reads *dum meus exiguo* . . ., which would give an additional syllable in common with our line (ex *isto*); but for a strong argument against that reading see P. Murgatroyd (1980) 298. It is reasonable to detect here direct allusion on Ovid's part: Tibullus' line appears to have been well-known in antiquity; so much so that Statius can employ it to allude to Tibullus' entire poetic output (*Silv.* 1.2.255 *divesque foco lucente Tibullus*). Knox regarded Ovid's allusion as 'poignant. . . . Tibullus wishes for a blazing hearth emblematic of his happy relationship with his mistress Delia, but Canace now wishes for death.' There is indeed a contrast between Tibullus' *focus* and Canace's *rogus*, but Knox's analysis does not fully fit the facts. The first six lines of Tibullus 1.1 run as follows:

> divitias alius fulvo sibi congerat auro
> et teneat culti iugera multa soli,
> quem labor assiduus vicino terreat hoste,
> Martia cui somnos classica pulsa fugent:
> mi mea paupertas vitam traducat inertem,
> dum meus assiduo luceat igne focus.

Love is not mentioned until verse 46, and Delia not until 57. The fire in the hearth at verse 6 represents not the poet's relationship with Delia, but rather his 'rustic *paupertas*' (see Murgatroyd (1980) *ad loc.*), and contrasts with the *divitias* and gleam of yellow gold (*fulvo . . . auro*) with which the poem begins. Ovid's allusion rounds off the section begun at 101, and shows him as an astute reader of Tibullus 1.1. Tibullus possesses not riches (1 *divitias*) and gleaming gold (*fulvo . . . auro*), but a fire blazing in his hearth (verse 6); Canace will be 'rich' from her father's gift of the sword (102 *dives*), but the fire in her case (106) will be that of the Furies (*isto*), blazing in her funeral pyre.

105 faces . . . Erinyes atras:
The mss. assign the adjective 'black' to the Erinyes themselves (*faces . . . Erinyes atrae*), and the majority of editors follow. For black Furies in Greek literature, see e.g. Aeschylus *Ag.* 462–3 κελαι-/ναί ('quo alludit Cicero *in Vatin.* 13 [*tu in templum Castoris te cum C. Fibulo atrato ceterisque tuis furiis funestum intulisti*]', Burman on our line), *Eu.* 52 μέλαιναι, *Septem* 699 μελάνακγις, Euripides *El.* 1345 χρῶτα κελαιναί, *Or.* 321 μελάγχρωτες and 408 νυκτὶ προσφερεῖς κόρας ("maidens resembling Night,". . . . Not "three similar maidens in the night," a recent and also ancient misinterpretation', C.W. Willink (1986) *ad*

loc.); and in Latin see *TLL* s.v. *ater* 1018,54ff., which cites Virgil *Aen.* 7.329 of Allecto, Silius Italicus 2.529 of Tisiphone and 13.575 of Megaera, and Statius *Theb.* 11.75 of Tisiphone. Cf. *Theb.* 4.633–4 *Furiarumque atra . . . concilia.*

Burman, however, suggested the emendation *atras* (agreeing with *faces*), and he is followed by Knox, and by A. La Penna (1995), who nevertheless would prefer to keep the conjecture in an apparatus rather than admit it to the text. Knox notes that '*atras*, an easy correction, gives better point, for black is especially associated with the flames of a funeral pyre (*TLL.* s.v. *ater* 1020.40–50).' Servius on Virgil *Aen.* 11.186 *ignibus atris* explains 'ignes atri non sunt; sed epitheton traxit de negotio, ut atris diceret, hoc est funeribus'; contrast Pease (1935) on *Aen.* 4.384 *atris ignibus*, '*ater* and *niger* are so universally associated with death . . . as to need no elucidation.' Black is a well-attested colour not only for funeral torches but also for those carried by the Furies: see J.W. Denniston - D. Page (1957) on Aeschylus *Ag.* 462, 'everything about the Erinyes is "dark"—their sinister aspect, their garments (*Ch.* 1049, cf. *Eu.* 352), even their skin', and in particular Virgil *Aen.* 4.384 [Dido speaks] *sequar atris ignibus absens* ('Dido will haunt Aeneas like a Fury. . . . But any sensitive reader, as Servius saw, will think of the smoke blowing over the breakers from Dido's pyre . . ., although she herself cannot have meant this', Austin (1955) *ad loc.*) and 7.456–7 *atro/lumine fumantis fixit sub pectore/taedas*, of Allecto. Post-Ovidian examples of black torches carried by the Furies are found at Seneca *Med.* 15 and Statius *Theb.* 4.133–4 *sontes Furiarum lampade nigra/quinquaginta ardent thalami*, of the murder of the sons of Aegyptus by their brides.

The rhetoric of our passage favours Burman's *atras.* 'Bear against me the black torches that you bear' perhaps makes for a more cogent statement than 'Bear against me the torches that you bear' (but see 103–6n. on the repetition). Moreover, *faces . . . atras* picks up, and contrasts with, 103 *faces . . . maritas*, thereby contributing to the 'symmetry' between the two couplets (103–6n.). The black torches of the Furies are envisaged as lighting Canace's funeral pyre, a task for which their colour makes them particularly apt.

107–8:
'. . . little more than a farewell prayer that those close to her have the good fortune that she has not' (Jacobson (1974) 161). The reader, however, cannot but detect here a reference to the marriage-lottery

(101n. *mea . . . conubia*). Bornecque-Prévost do not explain their obelism of this couplet.

108 amissae . . . mei:

= 'of me lost (in death)', *OLD* s.v. *amitto* 9 'To be parted from, lose, b (by death)' and *TLL* s.v. *amitto* 1922.10ff. (Ovidian examples are given at 23ff.). An adjective in agreement with objective genitive of a personal pronoun is unparalleled in Ovid (but cf. objective genitive of a personal prounoun with agreeing gerundive at 20.76 *copia placandi . . . tui, Trist.* 2.154 *spem placandi . . . tui*, 182 *placandi spem . . . tui*, and *Pont.* 2.2.100 *servandi cura mei*) and rare in Latin literature in general (but cf. Seneca *Med.* 555–6 *melioris tibi memoria nostri sedeat*). These are, however, insufficient reasons to reject the construction here; and *amissae . . . mei* is certainly superior to the alternative reading *admissi . . . mei* (= 'my crime'; see Knox on 7.106). Palmer's objection to *admissi* in our line, 'if [Cance's sisters] are to be married, a warning to beware of her guilt is out of place and useless' (cf. Knox *ad loc.*, who quoted Palmer and pronounced *admissi* 'a weak moralizing correction'), can be countered: although she assumes that her sisters will one day wed, Canace does not know that they are to be married soon, and to their brothers. However, the adversative force of *sed tamen* (*OLD* s.v. *tamen* 2c; for *sed tamen* postponed to this sedes, Kenney on 17.186 [184 his numbering] cites *Am.* 1.5.14, with McKeown (1989) *ad loc.*, and 3.5.8; see also *Fast.* 3.112 and 6.16), perfectly natural with *amissae*—'Marry well, but don't forget your dead sister'—is problematic if one reads *admissi*: the required sense would be 'Marry well, and don't forget the mistake I made'. *amissae* is correct. Canace bids her sisters remember her when she is gone, a request she also makes of Macareus (127).

amissus and *admissus* are easily confused, even at the best of times (so at e.g. 7.106). In our passage, three occurrences of *admitto/amitto* in close proximity (108 *amissae*, 109 *admisit* and 112 *admisso*, all of which attracted error in some parts of the tradition) no doubt provided the scribes with additional difficulty.

109–10:

The move from a plea addressed to her sisters to a lament for her child is unheralded by anything in the text, and the transition is not smooth; but it is, I think, unnecessary to postulate a lacuna. The modest length of the lament perhaps suggests a fuller version in

Euripides *Aeolus*, familiarity with which may have caused Ovid's reader to expect such a progression. In addition, the poet connects the two couplets 107–8 and 109–10 by means of the wordplay between *amissae* (see previous n.) and *admisit.* Cf. e.g. Terence *Ph.* 414–5 *amittere . . . admitteret*; the jingle became a favourite of Augustine's: see *TLL* s.v. *amitto* 1931.72–6, which cites *Epist.* 43.27 [*eclesia*] *nec in terris amittit nisi malos nec in caelum admittit nisi bonos*; 155.3 *nullum malum admittatur . . . summum bonum numquam amittatur*; and *in Psalm.* 36.21 *serm.* 2.13 *ad* [*hunc thesaurum*] *amittendum nec latro admittitur nec naufragium metuitur.*

Canace here makes use of a *topos* familiar from Greek tragedy, the innocence of the child that is put to death: see e.g. E. Fantham (1992) on Lucan 2.108. In our couplet the motif is coloured with the detail that the child is only just born—109 *tam paucis editus horis*, 110 *vix bene natus. bene* as an intensifying particle is common prior to Ovid (see e.g. Bömer (1969–1986) on *Fast.* 1.639 *nunc bene*), but its usage was extended by him: '*bene* als Füllwort, mit Ovid beginnend und bei ihm besonders beliebt', Bömer on *Met.* 2.47 *vix bene desierat.* For *vix bene* see *TLL* s.v. *bene* 2125.29–52 and again Bömer on *Fast.* 1.639 '. . . bedeutet nich mehr als *vix*'; cf. Knox on 6.24 '. . . means little more than *vix*'. Contrast J.B. Hall (1990) 278, who disliked *vix bene natus* and conjectured *vix bene notus.*

Canace's speech decrying the child's unjust fate must be considered in the light of the abortion attempt of 41f.; repetition of *quis* in our passage (109 *quid*, 110 *quo*) may actively recall similar repetition at 41 (*quas . . . quae*). Ovid's reader suspects that, in fact, the child will long outlive its parents: see S. Casali (1995), and my intro.

111:

si potuit meruisse necem, meruisse putetur. 'facon ingénieuse de dire qu'il ne l'a pas méritée', Bornecque-Prévost. One should perhaps rather punctuate *si potuit meruisse, necem meruisse putetur.* 'If he was able to deserve [anything], let him be thought to deserve death [sc. but as a child he cannot be guilty of any crime]'. For the concept of an age of criminal responsibility, see T.E.J. Wiedemann (1989), esp. 114.

112 plectitur:

'This verb is properly used of undeserved or vicarious punishment', Palmer; he adduced a handful of passages, from Ennius to Ausonius, in support of his claim. Since Canace's child is, in the eyes of its

mother at least, innocent of any crime, the nuance is welcome here; it is equally felicitous at *Am.* 1.13.41 (the poet, addressing Aurora, goddess of the dawn, attributes her habit of interrupting nocturnal amours to her dissatisfaction with her own decrepit husband) *cur ego plectar amans, si vir tibi marcet ab annis* and at *Her.* 21.55–6 (Cydippe addresses her two rival suitors) *vos pace movetis/aspera submota proelia,— plector ego.* However, at *Am.* 1.7.29–30 (the poet upbraids himself for having struck his mistress) *an, si pulsassem minimum de plebe Quiritem,/ plecterer, in dominam ius mihi maius erit?*, context suggests that *plecterer* denotes a punishment wholly merited; cf. the explicit *iure igitur plectimur* at Cicero *Off.* 2.28.

113 nate, dolor matris:

L. Castiglioni (1937) 60 found a Greek counterpart to this phrase— τέκνον . . . ὦ/ματρὸς ἄλγος—at Euripides *Rhesus* 896–7, in Terpsichore's lament for her son, the eponymous hero. 'It is possible that Euripides, who so often imitates himself, utilized the same sentiment in his *Aeolus* and Ovid took it from there'. There is, however, something to be gained from regarding Canace's *nate, dolor matris* as an allusion to the Muse's τέκνον . . . ὦ/ματρὸς ἄλγος. Both Williams and Casali have noted the contribution made by allusion to dramatic irony in the epistle (Williams (1992) 207 8 and Casali (1995) 510–1). Here, in echoing the words of Terpsichore, who holds the corpse of her son in her arms (see the chorus' description of the goddess at 886–8 τίς . . . θέοι . . . τὸν νεόκμητον νεκρὸν ἐν χειροῖν/φοράδην πέμπει), Canace calls attention to the fact that she herself has no corpse over which to lament—as she thinks, because the baby has been exposed in the wilds; as the reader suspects, because it is not dead, but has been reprieved (see intro).

rabidarum . . . ferarum:

rabidarum is a reading in some late mss. (see Burman here, and cf. Goold (1974) 478; it is not mentioned in Dörrie's apparatus); the majority have *rapidarum*, printed by most editors. Cf. 10.96, where the mss. offer both *rapidis . . . feris* (printed by Dörrie) and *rabidis . . . feris* (there, at any rate, Dörrie notes the alternative readings).

It is a moot point whether *rapidus* may be applied to wild beasts where, as here, the context concerns rather their ferocity than their rapidity. Representative of those who deem *rapidus* suitable in such circumstances are Heinsius on 10.96, who, having cited passages

where he wished to print *rabidus*, conceded 'rapidae . . . ferae pro rapacibus dictae videntur'; and Palmer on our line, 'it seems possible that Roman writers sometimes intentionally used *rapidus* with the derivation from *rapio* before their eyes in the sense of "tearing"'. Cf. *OLD* s.v. *rapidus* 4 '(of men, animals, etc.) Violent, fierce'. Contrast e.g. the remarks of Lachman (1850) on Lucretius 4.712, '. . . nam vix credibile est etiam nunc magistros esse qui ut olim pueros doceant rapidum et trepidum non esse celerem et commotum, sed rapacem et tremibundum'; cf. D.R.S. Bailey (1956) 202–3 on Propertius 3.19.10, 'nearly all these confusions [sc. between *rapidus* and *rabidus*] have vanished from modern texts, save that *rapidis* . . . *feris* and *rapidarum* . . . *ferarum* continue to appear in Ov. *Her.* 10.96 and 11.111 [= our line]' (indeed, they were consigned to the apparatus in Giomini's 1958 ed., and did not gain a place in the text until Goold's 1976 revision of Showerman).

Planudes' rendering of our line as ὦ παῖ, τῆς μητρὸς οδύνη, λεία λύκων ἁρπάγων (cf. ἅρπαξι in his version of 10.96) need not, as Knox implied in his apparatus, suggest that he was translating *rabidarum*; he may, like Palmer, have taken *rapidus* as a synonym for *rapax*.

I prefer *rabidus* to *rapidus* here: while *rapidus* may sometimes have the sense 'snatching', it must always have a sense of rapid motion.

116:

The Virgilian allusion was noted only recently, Casali (1995) 510–1. Virgil anticipates Evander's reaction to the death of his son Pallas, thus:

> o **dolor** [cf. 113 dolor matris] atque decus magnum rediture parenti,
> **haec te prima dies bello dedit, haec eadem aufert,**
> cum tamen ingentis Rutulorum linquis acervos!
> (Virgil *Aen.* 10.507–9)

Ovid makes Virgil's phrase his own and attempts to improve upon it. The concept of the day that is both first and last (the *topos* can, predictably enough, be found in epitaphs: see e.g. *CE* 640 (= *CIL* 5.1710) *hec eadem nox una dedit talamosque necemque*, where the same day is the first of marriage and the last of life) is in his balanced pentameter neatly expressed (rather too neatly for Verducci (1985) 226, who termed the paradoxical antithesis 'axiomatic or, less generously, automatic in Ovid'). A pentameter with interchangeable halves is characteristically Ovidian: cf. 13.102n., 163–4n., 14.106n. Two verbs

in Virgil (*dedit, aufert*) become in Ovid the one verb *fuit*, poignant and telling: Pallas' death meant that the same day saw the beginning and end of his role in the battle; Canace laments that the same day saw the beginning and end of her child's life. The tense of *fuit*, perfect rather than imperfect, gives a sense of finality (see e.g. K-S 1.125, 'Diese Perfekt . . . die nicht bloß vollendet ist, sondern überhaupt aufgehört, hat zu bestehen also gegenwärtig nicht mehr ist . . .'). In Canace's view, the child has already met its end.

The allusion highlights Canace's cruel situation. Pallas' death in battle will be bitter-sweet news to Evander (*Aen.* 10.507 *dolor atque decus magnum*) as he considers not only Pallas' death but also his successes on the battlefield (10.509). Canace can find no consolation, not even that derived from performing the funeral rites (117ff.).

The dramatic irony present in our verse—this has not in fact been the child's *summa dies* (see intro.)—acquires a sharper focus against the backdrop of *Aen.* 10.508, which has all the authority of the poet-narrator; in the mouth of Canace, a mere character-narrator not in possession of the full facts, Virgil's line is stripped of its authority. Casali loc. cit. notes the ironic force of the echo.

117–20:
The one consolation usually available to the bereaved—the carrying-out of funeral rites—is denied Canace. The ritual elements described here are such as a mother would perform for her dead child: see e.g. Seneca *Tro.* 799–801 and 806–9, where Andromache addresses her son Astyanax before he is led to his death:

> . . . oscula et fletus, puer,
> lacerosque crines excipe et plenus mei
> occurre patri . . .
> . . . sume nunc iterum comas
> et sume lacrimas, quidquid e misero viri
> funere relictum est, sume quae reddas tuo
> oscula parenti.

Ovid's lines are pathetic indeed and, as Casali (1995) 510 notes, 'have melted many a critic.' But I find unhelpful the widely-held view that the passage is free from poetic artifice, for which see esp. Amar 'Hi versus et qui sequuntur ad v. usque 124 ex animo vere materno effluunt, nullo apparatu, ambitione nulla infucati; et quod apud Nasonem rarius nullus hic poetae locus; totum mater occupat', quoted by Loers (1825) and Palmer, and alluded to by Purser in the

preface to Palmer, p. 19; cf. the remarks of A.F. Sabot (1976) 342 on *Her.* 11.115ff., 'Le vocabulaire le plus simple, les termes les plus banals se chargent ici de poésie'. It is conceivable that Euripides' Canace made a similar lament with which these lines of Ovid's had some poetic relationship. That the poet has not here been ousted by the mother can, however, be demonstrated without recourse to such speculation.

The mother unable to perform funeral rites for her child is a figure with a respectable literary history; see e.g. the lament of Euryalus' mother in Virgil *Aen.* 9, esp. 486–9:

> '. . . nec te tua funere mater
> produxi pressive oculos aut vulnera lavi,
> veste tegens tibi quam noctes festina diesque
> urgebam, et tela curas solabar anilis'.

P. Hardie (1994) there finds mention of her in the battlefield taunts of Odysseus (Homer *Il.* 11.452–3) and of Achilles (*Il.* 21.123–4), and in Tibullus' 'death-bed' elegy, 1.3.5–6. In addition he cites Merope's lament for her dead husband and sons at Ennius *Cresphontes* fr. 59 Jocelyn:

> neque terram iniicere neque cruenta convestire corpora
> mihi licuit neque miserae lavere lacrimae salsum sanguinem.

Our passage continues this tradition, and indeed shares some features with both the Ennius and the Virgil. Ovid's *non mihi te licuit* (117) contains both the *neque/non* phraseology of Ennius and a telling juxtaposition of pronouns like that at the beginning of the lament for Euryalus (*Aen.* 9.481 *hunc ego te, Euryale, aspicio?*); and his anaphora of *non* corresponds with anaphora of *neque* in Ennius. These motifs in common may arise simply from the common subject-matter, and are too vague to claim as specific allusions. Nevertheless, the fact that Ovid devotes only two couplets to this theme, which would surely have provided material for several more verses, suggests that he was aware of previous fuller treatments. The verses 117–9 may be moving, but no more so than the other examples of this literary *topos*.

Jacobson (1974) 171 notes that themes deployed in the birth scene (47ff.) occur again here: the tears of pain at verse 56 become at 117 a mourner's *lacrimae iustae* (for *iustus* applied to funerals and their elements see *TLL* s.v. *iustus* 719.35f.); the hair torn by Macareus in his distress (59 *scissa . . . coma*) is here (118 *tonsas comas*) the lock dedi-

cated to the dead (see Knox); and the position adopted by Macareus over Canace's bed (59 *incumbens*) is that adopted by a mourner over the corpse (cf. e.g. *Met.* 6.277 *corporibus gelidis incumbit* of Niobe, and Lucan 6.563ff. of a witch who, in the service of her craft, pretends to bend over and kiss the dead). Jacobson loc. cit. regards the *oscula frigida* of 119 (cf. e.g. Propertius 2.13.29 *osculaque in gelidis pones suprema labellis*) as a counterpart to 60 *pressa refovisti pectora nostra tuis*. The correspondences link the child's birth with its apparent death, events which, as Canace believes, occurred pathetically close together (116).

121:

'I too (as well as my child) will seek out the silent (*infantis* acc. pl.) shades, by inflicting a wound (*cum vulnere, OLD* s.v. *cum* 6b)'. For the silent dead, cf. 13.108n. The exequial sense of the verb *prosequor* (*OLD* s.v. *prosequor* 1b) suggests a further meaning for *infantis . . . prosequar umbras*: 'I will escort as a mourner the ghost of my child': in the absence of a real funeral, Canace will escort her dead infant only as an *umbra* herself; with the plural-for-singular *umbras* (= the child's ghost), cf. e.g. *Met.* 1.387 and 3.720. Cf. Heinsius on our line (but contrast his note on 9.86 where he cites our line with the corrupt variant *persequar*). Emendation of *vulnere* to *funere* would heighten the ambiguity: 'I will descend to the shades through death (*cum funere*)' or 'I will accompany my child at its funeral (*cum funere*)'. For *prosequor* used to introduce a funereal undertone, cf. *Am.* 1.4.61–2 *nocte vir includet; lacrimis ego maestus obortis,/qua licet, ad saevas prosequar usque fores*, where the poet's reaction to losing his mistress to his rival for a night echoes that of a mourner at a funeral; and *Trist.* 1.8.14 *exequias prosequerere meas*, where the poet denotes his exile as a funeral.

Most scholars (including Palmer and Knox) have taken the line to mean 'I will accompany my child', with *infantis* as either genitive singular noun, or accusative plural adjective 'belonging to a child' (so Heinsius on 9.86).

123 frustra . . . sperate:

The phrase picks up 63 *spes bona*. Macareus bade Canace hope for marriage, a hope which she now throws back as *frustra*. Palmer notes that *speratus* may refer specifically to marriage; cf. Knox, who compares the use of the substantive *speratus* as a synonym for *sponsus*. The phrase sets the tone for the epistle's closing lines, a veiled rebuke to her brother for not having put the words of his promise (63–4)

into action. Canace, having as she believes been thus let down, has low expectations of her brother; so much so that she evidently feels he will not even approach her corpse nor shed tears (127–8) unless so instructed (cf. Verducci (1985) 226, 'Canace ends her epistle with two [sc. 123–6 and 127–8] modest proposals'). The reader knows better: not only has Macareus kept his promise, but also Canace's last requests will be unfulfilled 'not because her lover loves her too little but because he loves her too much' (Verducci 228). For Macareus' suicide in the pre-Ovidian myth, see 62n. Canace's naïveté in all things amatory (cf. esp. 28n., 29–34n.) takes on here a tragic dimension, as she fails to foresee the reaction of a bereaved lover.

124:
Note the hyperbaton: the scattered words reflect the scattered limbs. Cf. a similar effect at 6.129–30 *spargere quae fratris potuit lacerata per agros/corpora, pignoribus parceret illa meis?*

125–6:
Canace requests that her remains be buried along with those of her child—perhaps a detail from Euripides *Aeolus*: Euripides included a similar motif in his *Medea*, where (1220–1) the corpses of Creon and his daughter Creusa are described as in one another's embrace, κεῖνται δὲ νεκροὶ παῖς τε καὶ γέρων πατὴρ/πέλας (cf. Seneca *Med.* 880 *nata atque genitor cinere permixto iacent*). For the joint burial of parent and child, cf. [Ovid] *Ep. Drus.* 161–3 (Drusus' Mother, Livia, to her dead son) '*quod licet, hoc certe: tumulo ponemur in uno,/Druse, neque ad veteres conditus ibis avos./miscebor cinerique cinis atque ossibus ossa*'. A far more common variant of the same basic motif is that of the pair of lovers buried together: see e.g. Bömer on *Met.* 11.705–7 (Ceyx and Alcyone) '*inque sepulcro/si non urna, tamen iunget nos littera, si non/ossibus ossa meis, at nomen nomine tangam*'; and on *Met.* 4.166 (Pyramus and Thisbe) '*quodque rogis superest, una requiescit in urna*', where his citations include *CE* 1338 *suscipe me sociam* [cf. *socio . . . sepulchro* in our couplet] *tumulis dulcissime coniunx.*

The phrasing of 126 may be regarded as hinting at this more familiar version of the *topos*; and it is tempting to speculate that, in the myth with which Ovid's reader was familiar, Canace and Macareus, dead by the same sword (see Stobaeus 4.20.72, quoted under 62n.), were buried in the same tomb.

Although the sentiment of 125–6 may be Euripidean, the detail

quamlibet arta is probably Ovidian: for Ovid's interest in the size of the funeral urn, especially in relation to the ashes it contains, cf. *Am.* 3.9.40 *vix manet e tanto, parva quod urna capit*; *Met.* 12.615–6 *et de tam magno restat Achille/nescio quid, parvam quod non bene compleat urnam*; and *Trist.* 3.3.65 *ossa tamen facito parva referantur in urna.*

127 vive:

Canace again (cf. my note on 123) picks up on Macareus' words to her during the birth scene. She returns to him the order (61 and 62 *vive*) which she herself is about to contravene. He too, however, will disobey. Bournecque-Prévost athetize 127–8 (with no reason given), thereby removing this highly effective echo.

in vulnera:

vulnera is a minority reading, printed by most editors. Alternative readings are:

> *in funere*, = 'at my funeral', with perhaps some causal sense (*TLL* s.v. *in* 782. 47ff., *OLD* s.v. *in* 40b; printed by Dörrie, following several of his mss.[11]
>
> *in funera*, = 'onto my corpse' (see *OLD* s.v. *funus* 2 'A dead body, corpse'); not recorded by Dörrie, but mentioned by other edd. as a late reading and printed, according to Palmer, in early editions.
>
> *in vulnere*, presumably = 'over/at/because of my wound,' printed by Bornecque/Prévost, who athetize this couplet.

Cf. *Met.* 13.490 *lacrimas in funere/funera/vulnere/vulnera fundit.* The reading of P in our line is obscured by damage to the ms. ('Ultima tria verba ob maculam vix leg. in P,' Giomini): the editors agree that it is some case of *vulnus* (so much is discernible even from a photograph copy), but disagree over the final letter. The first hand of one ms. (G) reads *fulnere*, which may indicate the path of corruption from *funus* to *vulnus*, or *vice versa*. *in* + acc. is in our line preferable to *in* + ablative: Canace's request that Macareus should not recoil from her dead body (128) is better motivated if 127 imagines him standing over the corpse to wash it, or the wound, with his tears. For tears as a poetic substitute for the wine or water sprinkled on the remains,

---

[11] Verducci (1985) 228 '. . . Dörrie in his 1971 edition has emended the *lacrimas in fulnere funde* of a single manuscript (G) to *lacrimas in funere funde* . . .' is an error caused by the confusing layout of Dörrie's apparatus.

cf. 14.127–8n., and see Nisbet-Hubbard (1970) on Horace *Carm.* 2.6.23 *debita . . . lacrima.* Similarly, the specific *vulnera* (see Verducci (1985) 228 'We are all too familiar with the sword and its destined locale') is preferable to the vague and uninteresting *funera.* Heinsius gives parallels for pouring tears onto a wound. The corruption *vuln-* (to *fuln-* ?) to *fun-* would have been aided by the neighbouring *funde.*

H. Magnus (1914) in his ap. crit. on *Met.* 13.490, where he prints *in volnere*, rejects the reading *volnera*, citing nearby verses to demonstrate that 'unum vulnus est.' Canace too will deal herself only one blow (100 *pectoribus condam dona paterna meis*; cf. 121 *vulnere*). But the plural *vulnera* can refer to a single wound: cf. *Met.* 4, where Pyramus' self-inflicted sword-wound is designated with the singular *vulnere* at 120 (*ferventi moriens e vulnere traxit*) and with the plural *vulnera* at 140 (*vulnera supplevit lacrimis*).

129–30:

The text is as problematic at the epistle's end as at its beginning. Heinsius believed this final couplet to be the work of an interpolator; he was followed by Wiese (who prints *tu, rogo, proiectae nimium mandata sororis/perfer! mandatum perfruar ipsa patris*) and by Bornecque-Prévost (text as Dörrie's) in marking it spurious.

Two particular areas of difficulty may be isolated. First, 129–30 *mandata . . . perfer.* Canace is addressing Macareus, not an intermediary, and *mandata . . . perfer* would give the meaning 'deliver my commands,' rather than the 'carry out my commands' that is required: see Housman (1897a) 242. Burman claimed for *perferre* this latter sense ('*perferre* potest capi pro exsequi'), citing Pliny *Nat.* 18.20 *ut perferam senatus populique Romani mandata*, where however the meaning is 'deliver a message,' not 'carry out orders'.

Second, 130 *mandatis persequar.* This, the reading of, among others, P *ante correctionem*, makes no good sense. *mandatum persequar* (read among others by P *post correctionem*; cf. Planudes' αὐτὴ διώξομαι τὴν τοῦ πατρὸς ἐντολήν) gives the required meaning: see *OLD* s.v. *persequor* 10 'To go through with or persist in a course of action,' which cites the Ovidian example *Met.* 8.774 *persequitur scelus ille suum*; Housman (loc. cit.), however, was not impressed: in comparison with the reading *mandatis perfruar* ('enjoy': for the ironic use of *perfruor* by Ovid see *Her.* 8.106 *perfruor infelix liberiore malo*), which he termed 'grammatical but laughable,' he thought *mandatum persequar* 'better but very bad.' He suggested *mandatis opsequar*: see *OLD* s.v. *obsequor* 3 'To com-

ply (with), submit (to commands, etc.)'; the word occurs in Ovid at *Fast.* 5.479 and *Met.* 1.488. Housman supported his conjecture with an ingeniously simple palaeographical argument: 'some accident obliterated o, and *psequar* was mistaken for *psequar*.' *mandatum persequar* and *mandatis perfruar* he explains as the result of ms. 'corrections' of the garbled *mandatis persequar.* He completed his attempt to restore the couplet by replacing *perfer* with the emendation *perfice,* found in one ms. by Heinsius.[12] Housman's conjecture

> tu, rogo, dilectae nimium mandata sororis
> perfice: mandatis opsequar ipsa patris

was accepted into the text, unathetized, by Goold and Knox, and followed by Reeve (1973) 333. It is at any rate undeniably preferable to Palmer's *tura rogo placitae nimium mandata sororis/tu fer: mandatum persequar ipsa patris,* which Housman (1899) 174 chastized thus: '[it] gives a frivolous sense, and makes *mandata* an adjective in the one line while *mandatum* is a substantive in the other. What is φιλαυτία if this is not?' He was no doubt somewhat aggrieved that Palmer had not even mentioned the conjecture made by Housman himself one year earlier; nevertheless, it must be admitted that this is not one of Palmer's best efforts. That *rogo* as a parenthesis ('I ask of you') is unparalleled in Ovid does not, I think, present a problem, since similar parentheses are common (e.g. *precor:* see e.g. 124; and *Met.* 13.598 *da, precor, huic aliquem, solacia mortis, honorem,* where *precor* occurs in the same *sedes* as *rogo* here). Certainly, there is no need to follow Palmer in taking *rogo* as the dative singular of *rogus.*

127–8 would produce an intolerably abrupt conclusion to the letter; thus 129–30, if an interpolation, has displaced a genuine couplet. In my opinion, this couplet is genuine. Admittedly, even in Housman's emended version of the paradosis there are features which one might regard as evidence of an interpolator: 129 bears a great similarity with 123 and might have been constructed from it; *dilectae nimium* contains an idea already expressed at 25–6. However, the dependency of 129–30 is not slavish and does, I think, have point: through the repetition of *tu* and *soror* (123, 129), Canace's requests

[12] What Heinsius actually wrote is '*mandatum perfice* Gottorpianus, quomodo et Slichtenhorstius conjiciebat,' which seems to present *perfice* as a candidate not for the first word of the line, but for the third. This is unlikely to be anything but a simple slip on Heinsius' part.

of her brother gain a stress that is pleasingly at odds with its modest content (cf. my note on 123); and *dilectae nimium* contains a third (cf. 123, 127) rebuke: unlike the previous two, however, this one proves justified (123n.).

I consider Housman's adoption of *perfice* to be sound; but his *mandatis opsequar*, although neat, is not, I think, what the poet wrote. Housman (1897a) 242 objected to *mandatum persequar* on the grounds that 'the singular *mandatum* after the plural *mandata* is most incompetent writing;' but the contrast between singular and plural would underline a crucial point. Canace has given to her brother a series of commands (*mandata sororis*) which one might expect to be carried out without great difficulty; she has received from her father one single command (*mandatum . . . patris*),[13] performable by herself alone, as she thinks (*ipsa*), which demands rather more. The contrast produces a neat epigrammatic conclusion (for epigrammatic final couplets in the *Heroides*, see especially those of epistles 2, 4, 7 and 13). I therefore prefer

. . . perfice; mandatum persequar ipsa patris

and tentatively conjecture

. . . perfice; mandatum perficit ipsa patris

The use of the same verb, *perficio*, in both sentences brings out the antithesis between 129 *mandata* and 130 *mandatum*; and the third person closure mirrors the third person opening (cf. 'distancing' in the closure of *Her.* 14, 131–2n.). No palaeographical explanation for the corruption from *perficit* can be quite as neat as that from Housman's *opsequar*, although a third-person verb might well have caused some scribal confusion. Explanation of how *mandatum* became *mandatis* is difficult, but not, as Housman claimed, impossible ('the corruption into *-is* of the acc. termination *-um* by the side of a transitive verb is nothing less than inexplicable'): if at some point in the tradition the symbol ʃ was used to denote *-um* (Lindsay (1915) 359), the corruption would have been almost inevitable.

[13] '127 [129] *mandata*: the last directive of a dying person, for which the singular *mandatum* is regular in legal language, but elsewhere rare . . .', Knox (1995). This is no case against the singular *mandatum* in 130, whose number is chosen not for any nuance of meaning, but to stress that there is only one command. Cf. Laodamia's *mandato . . . parvo* with which her epistle closes.

129 dilectae nimium:
This, the reading of F and G, is claimed by Dörrie as also the reading of the first hand of P, which is erased and barely discernible. For the delayed *nimium*, cf. *Trist.* 2.457 *denique ab incauto nimium petit ille marito.* Heinsius and Wiese print *proiectae nimium*, which appears in the margin of P and in the majority of mss; Giomini prints *provectae nimium*, which he wrongly claimed as the marginal reading of P: neither seem worthy alternatives for *dilectae.*

COMMENTARY ON *HEROIDES* 13, LAODAMIA TO PROTESILAUS

Synopsis of the myth

Protesilaus is king of Phylake in Thessaly. One time suitor of Helen (Hesiod, Hyginus), he marries Laodamia, but the wedding is marred by ceremonial negligence on Laodamia's part: Catullus hints at her failure to perform the necessary sacrifices. While still newly-married (and after only one day of married life according to the scholia on Aristides and Lucan), Protesilaus joins the Greek expedition against Troy. His reasons for departure are rarely made explicit: the scholiasts on Aristides and Lucan make him an unwilling conscript, but in Lucian's underworld, Aeacus accuses Protesilaus of forgetting his newly-wed wife by the time he arrived at Troy; and, in a fragment from Laevius, Laodamia expresses her jealous anxieties over her absent husband's faithlessness.

Protesilaus' military career is short-lived. When the Greek fleet finally arrives at Troy after its delay at Aulis, Protesilaus rushes ashore and is cut down by a Trojan warrior, usually Hector. Protesilaus thus fulfills an oracle, aimed specifically at him according to a version reported by Eustathius, that the first Greek to land at Troy would be killed: in Hyginus, his name was originally Iolaus, and he earns his new name Protesilaus, 'first of the people' or 'first-leaper', through the manner of his death. Homer briefly and suggestively mentions the weeping wife and half-complete home the dead man leaves behind.

The two major motifs of the myth are Protesilaus' return from the dead to visit his wife, and Laodamia's devotion to an image of her husband. Protesilaus' resurrection is short (variously three hours, a few hours, one night, or one day), but sweet (suggestions of the couple's lovemaking are found in some versions). Laodamia's relationship with the image is sexually charged, and sometimes has Bacchic overtones. Versions of the myth vary in their inclusion and combination of these two motifs (see my note on 105–8); but in no version does Laodamia devote herself to the image while her husband is still alive, and in one instance (pseudo-Apollodorus) she makes

the image while she falsely believes Protesilaus to be alive at Troy—a feature of the myth that Ovid's poem exploits to good effect.

Laodamia's own untimely death is a staple feature. Either she stabs herself or 'pines away' when her husband returns to the underworld (in a fragment from Euripides' play, she appears to contemplate hurling herself down a well as an alternative method); or else she burns to death on the bonfire onto which her father has thrown the image in an attempt to cure her of her obsession.

Wordsworth, adducing a scholarly reference to Pliny's *Natural History* in his notes, provides a poignant coda:

> Yet tears to human suffering are due;
> And mortal hopes defeated and o'erthrown
> Are mourned by man, and not by man alone,
> As fondly he believes.—Upon the side
> Of Hellespont (such faith was entertained)
> A knot of spiny trees for ages grew
> From out the tomb of him for whom she died;
> And ever, when such stature they had gained
> That Ilium's walls were subject to this view,
> The trees' tall summits wither'd at the sight;
> A constant interchange of growth and blight!
>
> (Wordsworth, *Laodamia* [revised] 164–174)

Sources

Ausonius *Epigrammata* 41.5–6, *Epitaph* 12
Catullus 68
Cypria EGF 18 (= Pausanias 4.2.7)
Dictys Cretensis *Ephemeris Belli Troiani* 2.11
Euripides *Protesilaus* fr. 646a–57 Nauck
Eustathius on Homer *Iliad* 2.700–2, 2.701, *Odyssey* 11.521
Hesiod *Catalogue* 199
Homer *Iliad* 2.698–702
Hyginus *Fabulae* 103–4
Laevius *Protesilaodamia FLP* 13–9
Lucian *Dialogi Mortuorum* 28, 28, 410
Minucius Felix *Octavius* 11.8
Nonnus *Dionysiaca* 24.192–5 [a widowed Indian girl is termed a second Laodamia]
Ovid *Amores* 2.18.38 *Ars Amatoria* 2.356, 3.16–7, *Ex Pont.* 3.1.109–10, *Metamorphoses* 12.67–8, *Remedia* 723–4, *Tristia* 1.6.19–20, 5.14.39–40
Philostratus *Imagines* 2.9.5
Pliny *Natural History* 16.238

Proclus *Cypriorum Ennaratio* 13–5 (*EGF* pp. 30ff.)
Propertius 1.19.7–10
pseudo-Apollodorus *Epitome* 3.30
Schol. Aristides 3.671–2D
Schol. Lucian *Charon* 1
Schol. Lycophron *Alexandra* 530
Sophocles ΠΟΙΜΕΝΕΣ ('Shepherds') *TrGF* 497ff.
Statius *Silvae* 2.7.120ff. [implicit allusion to Protesilaus], 5.3.273
Theodectes *Lynceus TrGF* 3a
Tzetzes *Antehomerica* 248, *Chiliades* 2.5.759ff., 2.52, *Schol. ad Lycophronem* 245
Virgil *Aeneid* 6.447–8, and Servius there

LIMC s.v. *Protesilaos*

Several important versions of the myth are not extant. Proclus and Pausanias attest that the early epic *Cypria* treated the myth. Lost tragedies on the subject include plays by Pacuvius and Tit[in]ius, attested by Antonius Vulscus who adds that 'Ovid took from them a great deal for this epistle' ('Pacuvius et Titinius [Titius, C. Dilthey (1863) 59] Protesilaum tragoediam ediderunt ex qua multum in hanc epistulam Ovidius transtulit'); the scholiast on Lycophron claims that Sophocles' *Shepherds*, which concerned the arrival of the Greek force at Troy, included Protesilaus' death; and of Euripides' *Protesilaus*, only fragments and two snatches of summary (the scholia on Aristides and Lucian) survive, although some scholars have claimed that Hyginus closely follows the plot of that play. Laevius' self-consciously titled poem *Protesilaodamia* exists only as a handful of fragments. For a full discussion of lost treatments, see H. Jacobson (1974) 195ff.; R.O.A.M. Lyne (1998) charts the development of the myth, and the varying allegories that ancient authors draw from it.

1–2:

This introductory couplet has met with widespread suspicion.[1] Some scholars have been reluctant to condemn lines transmitted in the entire tradition: Micyllus stated that he would have counted them an interpolation 'nisi recepti ab omnibus forent'; and Luck attempted to undermine their ms. authority by claiming that they were supplied in P by a second hand. However, ms. authority will not settle

[1] It was considered spurious by Bentley, Sedlmayer, Palmer, Bornecque-Prévost, W. Schmitz-Croenenbroech (1937), E.A. Kirfel (1969) and G. Luck (1969). In his review of Dörrie's edition, G.P. Goold (1974) took a similar stance: in his discussion on spurious first couplets in the minority tradition he remarked 'Very likely 13.1f. is just such another address-interpolation.' His 1977 revision of Showerman's text, however, follows Showerman in printing 13.1 2 unathetized.

the matter in any case (see intro.), and, like all other introductory couplets, these lines must be judged on their own merits.

Some general objections have been made. The use of the third person (*mittit*) and of patronymics (*Haemonis Haemonio*) have both incurred suspicion, and both been defended: Kirfel (1969) 96–7, who named the antagonists and recounted the arguments, asserted that these were insufficient grounds to condemn the lines; his own objection against *Haemonis*, 'Ein Grund jedoch, der die Verse verdächtig erscheinen läßt, ist der, daß sich das Adjektiv «Haemonis» in der lateinischen Literatur nicht findet und als Substantiv erst bei Lucan im Plural vorkommt', is by no means persuasive: the feminine adjective *Haemonis* is easily formed from the familiar masculine adjective *Haemonius* ('Thessalian', 28 instances in Ovid) with which it is juxtaposed. With the juxtaposition of patronymics Laodamia asserts a close bond between herself and her addressee (cf. 11.1 *Aeolis Aeolidae*, which asserts an even closer bond—see n.). Both are Thessalian. Protesilaus was king of Phylake in Thessaly (Homer *Il.* 2.700). Laodamia's place of origin is less clear; for speculation that it was Phyllos in Thessaly, see 35n.

There has been disagreement over the meaning of the couplet. The majority of edd. so punctuate that *ire salutem* is accusative and infinitive after *optat*—a wish that the letter does not get lost in the post ('Greetings and health Haemonian Laodamia sends her Haemonian lord, and desires with loving heart they go where they are sent', Showerman-Goold). The point seems weak (even if one sees a pun on *salus* = the greetings sent in the letter and *salus* = the welfare of Protesilaus, Laodamia's constant concern), and does not make for an arresting opening: even Shuckburgh, who considered the couplet genuine, commented 'The point of the lines, not a very great one after all. . . .' I find unconvincing the analysis of H. Merklin (1968) 474, which attempts fully to integrate the couplet into the main body of Laodamia's epistle and regards 3–4 as arising out of *quo mittitur.* Nevertheless, these are not conclusive arguments against this interpretation: on 'inorganic' openings, see intro., and cf. the uncontested opening distich of *Pont.* 3.2, *quam legis a nobis missam tibi, Cotta, salutem,/missa sit ut vere perveniatque, precor. opto* + accuative and infinitive occurs, in place of the common *opto* (+ *ut* or *ne*) + subjunctive, at *Her.* 20.13–4; however, if *optat . . . quo mittitur ire salutem* is to refer to the letter's successful journey to its intended destination, *ire* is very feeble; contrast *missa sit ut vere perveniatque* at *Pont.* 3.2.2.

Preferable is the interpretation advanced by Micyllus: 'ordo verborum est, Amans Aemonis Laodamia mittit salutem viro Aemonio, et optat eo ire, quo mittitur salus, hoc est epistola'. The hexameter should be punctuated as follows:

mittit—et optat amans quo mittitur ire—salutem

Micyllus was followed only by D. Ruhnken (1831) 77. This interpretation makes for a sound opening: it gives point to *amans*: the lover's desire not to be separated from the beloved is a commonplace (e.g. *Am.* 2.11, Propertius 1.8, Tibullus 1.5, etc.); and it introduces the reader to the dramatic irony so prevalent in this epistle (see intro.). Laodamia wishes to follow her greetings in person; but, the reader suspects, Protesilaus is not at Aulis, as Laodamia thinks, but in the underworld (intro, 149ff.n.)—and Laodamia will, famously, follow him there (161–2n.). For parenthesis introduced with *et* see M. von Albrecht (1964) 54ff.: he recorded no parallel for a parenthesis in this metrical *sedes*; but for several examples of parenthesis beginning at a weak caesura in the first foot, and of parenthesis ending at a weak caesura in the fifth, see pp. 30ff. For introductory couplets that make a similar favourable comparison of a visit in person with correspondance by letter, cf. *Her.* 18 and 19.[2]

2 Laodamia:
Preferable to *Laudamia*, which will not scan. On the Latin orthography of Greek words beginning λαο-, see C.J. Fordyce (1961) on Catullus 68.74: Latin *-au-* for Greek -ao- is a diphthong. The reading of P in our line is regularly reported as *Laudomia*, particularly by those who print *Lau-* (e.g. Ehwald, Palmer): my microfilm copy of P clearly shows the third letter of the name as *o*, and the fifth letter, slightly less clearly, as *a*. In any case, the evidence of P is overrated: at 36 it badly mangles the name (*Laudamina*).

3 fama est:
The tale that has reached Laodamia is a familiar one: for *fama est* as an 'Alexandrian footnote' (11.1–2n.) signposting a literary tradi-

---

[2] Those introductory couplets too have been called into question; see Kenney on 18.1–2 and 19.1–2.

tion, see e.g. N. Horsfall (1990). On each of the three occasions when Ovid refers to the delay of the Greek fleet at Aulis (cf. *Met.* 12.8ff., 13.181ff.), he manipulates the myth, seizing on one detail and skimming over others. Here, 'the complex mythic structure that is the famous episode at Aulis becomes an ill wind that delays—Protesilaus!' (H. Jacobson (1974) 203). The *te* gains stress through hyperbaton: '*Te* is wonderful. The whole Greek expedition has been reduced to Protesilaus' (Jacobson 353). The heaven-sent wind that delays the destruction of Troy is nicely demeaned by its comparison with an elegiac commonplace, the wind that assists the course of a departing lover (4ff.; cf. e.g. 2.96, 5.50, 10.29–30).

This verse sets the letter at a particular point in the story. Scholars (e.g. L.P. Wilkinson (1955) 88, Jacobson (1974) 201) have commented on the resultant dramatic irony: Laodamia is ignorant of her husband's impending death on arrival at Troy. This irony may in fact be sharper still. *fama* is by no means a reliable source of information, and there is reason to suspect that, as she writes, her husband has already reached Troy and met his death. Cf. 149ff.n.

4 a me cum fugeres:
For *fugio a(b)* + ablative of person, cf. 3.42 and 8.110. Several editors, including Dörrie, take *a* as exclamatory; but it seems likely that *a!* is avoided immediately before a word in the ablative, or which might be taken as ablative: 8.104 *a! hoc* is almost certainly a false reading. Heinsius' suggestion *at* in our line seems too heavy-handed for the contrast between 3 and 4.

5 vestris obsistere remis:
The image of an unnavigable sea is suggested by this short sibilant phrase: similar alliteration, often sustained and elaborate, is common in storm-scenes (e.g. Pacuvius *Teucer* fr. 353–60).

For an inanimate object as the subject of *obsisto* (*freta* here), see *OLD* s.v. *obsisto* 2 and *TLL* q.v. 230.12ff.; but there is some degree of personification in *freta debuerant* ... *obsistere remis* (cf. verse 6 *saevis* ... *aquis*): the *freta* and *aquae* are reproached for not having opposed Protesilaus at the correct time, i.e. when he was leaving Phylake. Sea-winds come in for similar criticism elsewhere (e.g. 10.29 and 113); but, for Laodamia's attempt to blame everything but her husband for his departure, cf. 7ff.n. and 15n. *incubuit Boreas.*

6 saevis utile:
Oxymoronic juxtaposition: the moment of her husband's departure was, Laodamia asserts, a favourable time for unfavourable weather. For *utilis* of fair sailing conditions, see *Rem.* 280, *Met.* 13.630, *Pont.* 4.10.16.

7ff.
This 'departure-scene' contains elements common to the *topos* (7 *oscula, mandata,* 12 *amplexu*: note their occurrence e.g. among the passages discussed by Jacobson (1974) 385ff.), but the emphasis is on their premature curtailment (contrast in particular Laodamia's *oscula plura . . . dedissem* with the kisses at 2.94 *oscula per longas iungere pressa moras* and 5.51 *oscula dimissae quotiens repetita dedisti!*). For the tone of this scene, Ovid is drawing on the sense of unfulfilment found in e.g. Homer's δόμος ἡμιτελής (*Il.* 2.701; the exact interpretation of the phrase was debated by the scholiasts: see e.g. F.A. Paley (1866) *ad loc.*) and Catullus' *domum/inceptam frustra* (68.74 5): cf. Jacobson (1974) 204f., and W.H. Roscher (1884–1937) s.v. *Protesilaos* 3157.66–3158.30. The scene itself, however, may be Ovid's invention. Jacobson (1974) 210 notes the existence of 'an iconographic representation of the scene', but it is reckoned to be post-Ovidian ('About 170 A.D.', *LIMC* s.v. *Charon* 53).

J.-C. Jolivet (1992) 140 remarks on Protesilaus' eagerness to sail away in Ovid's scene:

> Le héros thessalien, lui, n'a pas perdu un instant pour partir à la guerre et le début de l'Héroide glose d'ailleurs sur le caractère précipité de son départ pout Troie.

He cites 9 *raptus es hinc praeceps*, 15 *incubuit Boreas abreptaque vela tetendit*, and 21 *vela fugacia.* However, while these phrases denote speed, they suggest the agency of external forces: even 4 *fugeres* need not imply that Protesilaus was avoiding his wife (Palmer *ad loc.*). Laodamia does not explicitly characterize her husband as keen to weigh anchor. Nevertheless, 'the feeling that Protesilaus is too eager to rush off, that it is only Laodamia who is concerned with delaying the departure' (Jacobson (1974) 387) is hard to shake off; the heroine omits even to suggest any reluctance on his part. Thus, while Laodamia seems to have failed to perceive any significance in the hasty departure, the reader may perhaps discern a prescursor to that eagerness for battle that precipitates the hero's death at Troy. At any rate,

according to a later, comic, treatment, any thoughts for his wife had been displaced by hope for glory by the time he arrived:

> [the ghost of Ajax addresses that of Protesilaus] . . . ἐκλαθόμενος τῆς νεογάμου γυναικός, ἐπει προσεφέρεσθε τῇ Τρῳάδι, οὕτως φιλοκινδύνως και ἀπονενοημένως προεπήδησας τῶν ἄλλων δόξης ἐρασθεὶς, δι' ἣν πρῶτος ἐν τῇ ἀποβάσει ἀπέθανες.
>
> (Lucian *Dial. Mort.* 27)

8 multa

plura, also in the ms. tradition, produces a full tricolon: cf. Heinsius *ad loc.* '*plura* magna librorum pars, quod arridet ut superiorum fit repetitio', Jacobson (1974) 206 'The sense of an achievement left undone is managed not only by the pluperfect subjunctive [*dedissem*], but by the futile yearning of the repeated comparatives . . .' (he nevertheless follows *multa*). But *multa* may have point: in addition to the further kisses and orders she might have given, there any many things she had not even started to say—perhaps a snide hint to Ovid's reader at female loquacity, and a further reason for Protesilaus' hasty departure?

9–10:

'You were snatched headlong, and there was a wind to beckon your sails, the sort of wind for which the sailors were hoping, but not I.' '*vocare* is often used of the wind' (Palmer, quoting from Virgil and Horace), but in Ovid only here; cf. however the comparable *quaque vocant fluctus, hac tibi remus eat, Rem.* 532.

10–11 ventus erat./ventus erat:

The closing words of 10 open 11. On such repetition, termed epanalepsis or (ep)anadiplosis, see Kenney on *Her.* 21.72–3 [74–5 Dörrie], Wills (1996) 124. Kenney cites Norden's tracing of examples of 'ἐπαναδίπλωσις' from Homer to Roman Elegy (E. Norden (1926) on Virgil *Aen.* 6.164) and Platnauer's discussion of the phenomenon (*LEV* 33–5; for repetition from pentameter end to hexameter beginning, as here, see specifically 34–5, section 2a).

The repetition of *ventus erat* represents Laodamia's concern with the *ventus* that carried her husband away—just as at 138–9, with epanalepsis of *arma dabit,* she focuses on the scene of the Trojan woman arming her husband for battle. Cf. 21.74–5 *ille secundus erat./ille secundus erat,* where the rhetoric dwells on the wind which tried to

keep Cydippe from leaving Delos. Kenney's remarks on that example, '. . . the emphasis seems a trifle heavy-handed', may perhaps be applied to our lines; but here at any rate the repetition serves a structural purpose: out of the epanalepsis develops a single-line sentiment which is almost a second pentameter for verse nine, reframing the idea expressed in verse ten. The poet is thereby free to begin a new sentiment in the pentameter at verse twelve—to good effect (see next n.).

12–4:

> It is extremely rare in the *Heroides* for a thought to begin in the pentameter and conclude with the following hexameter. Here the anomaly is wonderfully effective. This is structural counterpount, with the form played off against the substance. The pentameter struggles on, seeking continuity, fighting against interruption, against pause, while the words themselves declare separation and finish.
>
> (Jacobson (1974) 207)

The structure does not seem to me as striking as that at e.g. 12.64ff., where *mane erat* begins a new 'paragraph' in the pentameter (cf. F. Bessone (1997) *ad loc.*). But if our lines were regarded as a structual 'anomaly', *solvor* might be seen as providing a metaliterary 'footnote' on the effect (cf. *solutus* of flowing speech, *OLD* s.v. *solutus* 8, and of writing unconstrained by metre, *OLD* q.v. 9). *solvor* is also appropriate for the curtailment of a sailor's embrace (*OLD* s.v. *solvo* 4 '(naut.) To cast off').

13 mandatrix:

mandatis, read by the majority of mss., including P, and perhaps translated by Planudes' 'κἀν ταῖς ἐντολαῖς . . .', gives poor sense. It is printed only by Weise. *mandantis*, found in a handful of mss. and printed by the editors, is a reasonable correction. For the genitive participle of possessor with *mei* understood, cf. e.g. 4.175 *precantis*, 11.52 *clamantis*, 16.262 *orantis*, 18.36 *natantis*, and *Met.* 9.561 *fatentis*; and for the present participle of *mando* in Ovid cf. 16.316 and *Fast.* 5.475.

A possible alternative to *mandantis* is Heinsius' conjecture *mandatrix*. That it is unparalleled in Ovid, and not found at all until Claudian, *Cons. Hon.* 4.236 *mandatricem operum*, need cause no concern: for Ovidian neologisms in *-trix* cf. *iaculatrix* at 20.231, *Fast.* 2.155 and *Met.* 5.375; and *novatrix*, at *Met.* 15.252 only. *mandatrix*

personifies the *lingua*, as e.g. *victrix* personifies *manus* at 9.75–6, *Ars* 2.716, *Fast.* 1.335, *Met.* 4.740 and 8.421. The remark of R.G. Austin (1971) on Virgil *Aen.* 1.319 *venatrix*, 'This type of noun implies the practice of a profession', is not universally true: *mandatrix* here is like e.g. *spectatrix* at *Am.* 2.12.26 *spectatrix animos ipsa iuvenca dabat*, inasmuch as it describes not a general attribute but a state specific to the occasion. I follow the now familiar principle of 'giving the suggested alternative a turn in the text so that readers may, so to say, get their tongues around it', Kenney (1970a) 171.

The route of corruption to *mandatis* is easy from both *mandantis* and *mandatrix*. In either case, *mandata* in 7 is likely to have played a part. In the case of *mandatrix*, once the *r* has been lost (a common error after *t*: A.E. Housman (1897c) 247–8) the corruption is virtually complete.

verba imperfecta:
The elision *verb(a) imperfecta* may mimic the curtailment of Laodamia's words. Cf. Kenney on *Her.* 21.27 (25 his numbering): the re-use of the phrase *verba imperfecta relinquit/relinquo* (in the same *sedes*) there and at *Met.* 1.526 and *Trist.* 1.3.69 suggests that Ovid found the device pleasing. Cf. Virgil's rather harsher elision to the same effect, *Aen.* 4.388 *his medium dictis sermonem abrumpit*, with Austin (1955) *ad loc.*

reliquit:
The perfect *reliquit*, the majority ms. reading, is preferable to the present *relinquit*, printed by Burman: the verb is parallel with 14 *potui*, not *solvor* (which is almost a 'real' rather than an historic present—their separation is still felt).

14 potuit:
The editors print the majority reading *potui*. The variant *potuit* (sc. *lingua*), found in four mss. by Burman merits adoption into the text: certainly, it should at least be included in the apparatus (it is absent from Dörrie's). That a *lingua* may *dicere* is clear from 5.52; cf. Burman on 10.46, 'ita passim *lingua* et *os dicere*, et alia membra id facere dicuntur, quod nos per ea facere solemus'; see further my index s.v. 'distancing'. Cf. the similar choice at 10.45–6: some editors print *quid potius facerent, quam me mea lumina flerent,/postquam desieram vela videre tua?*; I prefer *desierant*.

illud . . . triste vale:

For *vale* as neuter noun, 'a goodbye', cf. *Met.* 6.509 and 10.62 *supremumque vale*, and at 3.501 *dictoque vale*. 'That sad farewell' is the lover's farewell (for *ille* = 'that famous . . .' cf. 14.95n.); but *illud . . . triste* may suggest to Ovid's reader the 'final farewell' (*OLD* s.v. *valeo* 3c '-*e* (-*eas*, etc.), Goodbye! . . . c (in taking leave of the dead)')—this is the last time Laodamia sees her husband alive (but not dead: cf. 105–8n.).

15 incubuit Boreas:

Boreas is not simply the correct wind to carry Protesilaus south from Thessaly to Aulis; in addition, his natural temperament is put to good use. Laodamia characterizes her husband's hasty departure as the result of being carried off by the wind particularly notorious for violence (*Met.* 6.685–6 *horridus ira,/quae solita est illi nimiumque domestica vento*; cf. F. Bömer (1969–86) on *Met.* 1.65, 'Der Wind [sc. Boreas] ist wegen seiner Wildheit besonders gefürchtet'), and with a record for wilful promiscuity (his conquests included Orithyia, Hyacinthus, and the mares of Dardanus—on this last see Homer *Il.* 20.223ff.). *incubuit* and *abrepta* may both carry connotations of violence: on *incubuit* see R.F. Thomas (1988) on Virgil *Georg.* 2.310–11 *tempestas . . . incubuit*, and my n. on 11.59–64.

abreptaque vela:

abrepta ('snatched away') is preferable to *arrepta* ('seized hold of', followed by Burman). Swooping down and snatching away is Boreas' stock-in-trade (previous n.), and a common activity of winds in general (Virgil *Aen.* 1.108 *tris Notus abreptas in saxa latentia torquet*). The mss. too favour *abreptaque*. In Ovid, where *abripio* is clearly correct, *arripio* appears as a variant (*Met.* 7.732, 10.160), while the reverse is not the case (*Ars* 1.393, *Met.* 6.552, 10.59, 13.386). The picture suggested by this small sample, that *abripio* corrupts to *arripio* more readily than *vice versa*, is to some degree supported by *TLL*, s.v. *abripio* 132.42 'in libris scriptis saepe *abr-* in *arr-* mutatum legitur', and s.v. *arripio* 'in libris interdum scribitur per unam *r*, confunditur cum *abripio*' (my emphases).

17–22:

Laodamia describes the stages by which Protesilaus' ship receded into the distance. 'This is effectively the opposite of what Ovid does

at 5.63ff.' (Jacobson (1974) 205); there, Oenone watches Paris and Helen gradually sail into focus.

Our passage has been unfavourably compared with the description of Ceyx' departure at *Met.* 11.463ff.:

> sustulit illa
> umentes oculos stantemque in puppe relicta
> concussaque manu dantem sibi signa maritum
> prima videt redditque notas; ubi terra recessit
> longius atque oculi nequeunt cognoscere vultus,
> dum licet, insequitur fugientem lumine pinum.
> haec quoque ut haud poterat spatio summota videri,
> vela tamen spectat summo fluitantia malo;
> ut nec vela videt, vacuum petit anxia lectum
> seque toro ponit: renovat lectusque locusque
> Alcyonae lacrimas et quae pars admonet absit.

Note the similar progression: from *maritum* (cf. 13.17 *virum*), to *pinum*, to *vela* (cf. 19, 20, 21 *vela*), before finally nothing can be seen (cf. 21–2). B. Otis (1970) 236 finds comparison of the two passages indicative of 'the difference between Ovid's epic and elegiac styles'. He regards the Heroidean episode as 'quite commonplace', and Laodamia's reaction at 23 4 as 'obviously contrived': cf. G.M.H. Murphy (1972) on *Met.* 11.473 '. . . the Laodamia episode seems contrived'. By contrast, the Alcyone passage is deemed skilful and moving. Otis emphasizes this difference rather unfairly, by rendering the *Met.* passage with rhyming iambics, and Laodamia's account with prose. Metre, as Otis intimates (p. 237 '. . . the otiose pentameters correspond to the light and generic description'), partly accounts for the difference in treatment: elegiac couplets readily lend themselves to a simple stage-by-stage description. However, the different contexts are at least as relevant. In our passage, a first-person narrator recounts an important episode: the repetitions *spectare . . . spectare; potui . . . poteram, poteram; vela . . . vela . . . vela* represent something of her emotion. The narrator's emphasis upon herself, seemingly criticized by Murphy ('The heroine is less interested in Protesilaus than in her own emotions') may have psychological motivation: for the suggestion that Ovid's Protesilaus, unlike Ceyx (see e.g. 461 *quaerente moras Ceyce*), departs readily, cf. 7ff.n.

A comparison is perhaps drawn between the two heroines: both, through a desire not to be separated from the husband, watch his ship until out of sight; both will later receive a vision of him in their

dreams (*Her.* 13.107ff., *Met.* 11.657ff.). In his treatment of Ceyx' departure, Ovid has embellished upon our passage: thus the three-stage disappearance of the ship becomes four-stage (with the addition of *Met.* 468 *fugientem . . . pinum*); Laodamia's swoon becomes Alcyone's poignant return to the empty marriage-bed (*Met.* 11.471–3); and Ceyx's departure finds a grim counterpart, when his wife observes the gradual approach of his tide-borne corpse (*Met.* 715ff.). Nevertheless, the poetic effect of our passage is not totally eclipsed by the later version.

Laodamia is obsessed by omens (see intro.), but the reader might notice here an omen that she has overlooked. Laodamia follows her husband's eyes with her own (18): to look back home when departing is a widespread ill-omen, both in the ancient world (e.g. M.C.J. Putnam on Tibullus 1.3.13–4) and in the modern (I. Opie – M. Tatem (1989) 233; cf. 300 for the ill-omen of watching someone depart).

23–4:

Fainting is not a surprising reaction to a beloved's departure (cf. e.g. Ariadne at 10.31–2), but the reader may see in this description of Laodamia's swoon a hint at her impending death. The reader familiar with the myth expects Laodamia to die soon after her husband, and, in some versions of the myth, Protesilaus' second descent to the underworld after his short return to the living is directly responsible for his wife's demise (cf. 149ff.n.). In that connection, *lux quoque tecum abiit* may be suggestive; and, although accounts of faints regularly employ the imagery of death (see the passages cited by Palmer and Ciofanus here), the abundance of such imagery in our couplet (*lux . . . abiit, tenebris . . . obortis, exsanguis*) is striking.

A post-Ovidian version of the myth, an A.D. second century sarcophagus now in Naples (*LIMC* s.v. *Protesilaus* 26), depicts, among other scenes, Laodamia's swoon, apparently in reaction to Protesilaus' return from the dead. It is possible that earlier in the mythical tradition Laodamia fainted away and died in shock at Protesilaus' return from the underworld. If so, Ovid has adapted that for Laodamia's reaction to her husband's departure for Troy, while retaining the sense of her impending death. *dicor* explains with Ovidian mock-pedantry how Laodamia can narrate what happened while she was unconscious; but it may also be an 'Alexandrian footnote' (11.1–2n.) signalling an allusion.

23 tenebrisque exsanguis:
Elision at a strong caesura in the fourth foot is common (M. Platnauer *LEV* 83). Dörrie does not report the variant *tenebris* (asyndeton), which Heinsius found in some mss.

23–4 obortis/succiduo:
Juxtaposition over line-break: the darkness rises, the knees fall.

25–6:
A trio of relatives struggles (*vix . . . vix . . . vix*) to revive (*OLD* s.v. *reficio* 5) Laodamia.

One may speculate that, in an earlier version, the fainting Laodamia was tended to by her nurse; at any rate, the Naples sarcophagus (*LIMC* s.v. *Protesilaus* 26; cf. 23–4n.) depicts such a scene. And it appears likely that in Euripides' lost *Protesilaus* the heroine's father offered to her consolations on her husband's death: see fr. 649 Nauck πέπονθεν οἷα καὶ σὲ καὶ πάντας μένει. Our couplet may be a combination of these two episodes, with the addition of a motif from Plautine comedy—the use of water to revive one from a faint (for which Ciofanus cites Plautus *Cur.* 311–3, Palmer *Mil.* 1331–2; cf. *Am.* 1058 and *Trin.* 1091–2). 'Sprinkle water' (*aquam aspergo* or sim.) appears to have been a proverbial expression, = 'revive'; cf. P.J. Enk (1953) on Plautus *Truc.* 366 and J.A. Barsby (1986) on *Bac.* 247.

The group of concerned relatives consists of Laodamia's parents and father-in-law. The names of the two men are given, and transmitted with (a fact which Dörrie's apparatus does not reveal) the mangling frequently suffered by proper names. For the name of the heroine's *socer*, P gives the correct *Iphiclus*; but Giomini records the ms. errors *yphidus, ysiphidus, ysiphilus* and *yphiocus*. Planudes' Ὑψίπυλος is a bizzare mistake (perhaps he had just been working on *Her.* 6, Hypsipyle to Jason). Ovid is here following the majority tradition that makes Protesilaus son of Iphiclus (Homer *Il.* 2.705, Herodotus 9.116, etc.), rather than the variant that makes him son of Actor (Hesiod *Catalogue* fr. 199.6). The name of Laodamia's father fares rather better with the mss: Giomini gives as variants to *Acastus* only two supralineal readings, *adrastus* and *achates*. The name *Acastus* for Laodamia's father occurs frequently in the mythological tradition (e.g. Eustathius on Homer *Il.* 2.701, Hyginus *Fab.* 103), and probably goes back to Euripides: Photius (A.D. 9th century) and the Suda

introduce a fragment from Euripides *Protesilaus* (647 Nauck) with ὁ Πρωτεσίλαος τῷ/'Ακάστῳ [ἀλκάστῳ and ἀλκάθῳ respectively in the mss.] φησίν . . . Ovid's Laodamia terms her father *grandaevus*: this Virgilian word (A.S. Hollis (1970) on *Met.* 8.520), used by Ovid only of fathers, might correspond to a Euripidean designation of Acastus as an old man.

Laodamia does not name her mother: neither does anyone else in ancient literature; cf. Palmer, '*mater*: her mother's name has not been handed down', Bornecque-Prévost, 'son nom ne nous a pas été transmis'. E. Di Lorenzo (1992) on our line names her Astydamia, from pseudo-Apollodorus *Bib.* 3.13.3 'Ἀστυδάμεια ἡ 'Ακάστου γυνή: he might equally have chosen Hippolyte (Pindar *N.* 4.57; Horace *Carm.* 3.7.18; Schol. on Apollonius Rhodius 1.224) or Cretheis (Schol. on Apollonius Rhodius 1.224; Schol. on Pindar *N.* 4.92a)—but it is rash to identify Acastus, husband of Astydamia/Hippolyte/Cretheis, with Acastus, father of Laodamia. That Laodamia's mother is never named, not even in our couplet where she stands alongside two named characters, suggests that she had no place in Euripides *Protesilaus*. Ovid conjures her up here as a concerned mother.

27:
The parental assistance is dutiful (*pium*), but unhelpful (*inutile*) because Laodamia wishes to be allowed to die (28); cf. a similar paradox at *Met.* 11.100–1, of the (in retrospect) foolish request granted by Bacchus to Midas, *huic deus optandi gratum, sed inutile fecit/muneris arbitrium.* Laodamia sees her own situation as typified by inopportune events (cf. 4ff., and with 27 *officium . . . inutile* cf. 6 *illud erat . . . utile tempus*), but that she has missed the greatest opportunity of all—to see her husband after his death—is her own fault: cf. 105–8n.

28:
It is with a considerable degree of hyperbole that Laodamia equates rousing from a faint with (an unwelcome) rescue from death. However, the reader familiar with the myth (cf. 23–4n.) will take her continuing desire for death (*indignor* present tense) at face value.

29 rediit:
The final *i* is here long. Thus frequently in Ovid with the third person singular perfect of compounds of *eo*; cf. also *inpediīt* (*Met.* 12.392), *petiīt* (*Am.* 3.5.30, *Met.* 2.567, 9.612, 13.444) and *prosiluīt* (*Met.*

6.658).[3] See e.g. Shuckburgh on our line; Heinsius, Palmer and Knox on *Her.* 6.31; and Platnauer *LEV* 60–1. This is not lengthening; rather, 'Ovid allows himself to return, *metri gratia*, to the older vowel quantity, ī (Platnauer 61; cf. Kenney on *Her.* 19.128 *periīt*).

In our line, as often where Ovid has recourse to this archaism, variant readings occur. They can be attributed to scribal attempts to 'rescue' the metre (*ut rediitque animus*; *ut redeunt animi*; *utque animus rediit*; the remainder reported by Dörrie are garbled versions of these three). Cf. e.g. the same phrase, *ut rediit animus*, with variants, at *Her.* 6.31 (where several edd., including Dörrie, print the almost certain scribal 'correction' *utque animus rediit*) and *Ars* 3.707.

dolores:
= The pain of love, usually plural, and here presented as a true physical pain (30 *momordit*, in Ovid of emotions only here and at *Am.* 2.19.43 *cura*, *Met.* 2.805–6 *dolor* and *Trist.* 4.10.123–4 *Livor*). For such pain returning after a fainting fit, cf. Seneca *Phaed.* 589 *quis me dolori reddit?*, which perhaps draws on our line. The corruption *furores*, given by two mss., was perhaps suggested by 34 *furor*; but for *furor*)(*dolor* cf. 6.140 and 16.237.

30 legitimus casta:
For the juxtaposition, cf. 16.286 *castaque legitimi.* Laodamia emphasizes that the *amor* she experiences is not a whim, but the love of a wife for her husband. The implicit suggestion that married love is superior to other kinds alludes to Propertius 4.3.49–50 (cited here by Palmer):

> omnis amor magnus, sed aperto in coniuge[4] maior:
> hanc Venus, ut vivat, ventilat ipsa facem.

The following couplet of our poem alludes to the following couplet of Propertius' (31–2n.). The relationship between the two poems is a sustained and dynamic one (Merklin (1968); cf. my intro.). Here,

---

[3] Perhaps also occubuīt, *Her.* 9.141. Platnauer *LEV* 60 thinks the reading corrupt; contrast e.g. E. Courtney (1965) 65, who holds that the line should read *semivir occubuit in letifero Eveno*, but that the whole epistle is not by Ovid.

[4] The sense of *aperto in coniuge* has been disputed: 'when one's spouse is present, available', W.A. Camps (1961), Merklin (1968) 467–8; 'when the beloved is one's acknowledged husband', W.G. Shepherd (1985), cf. 'where the beloved is one's lawful husband', H.E. Butler (1905). Others favour emendation.

the Propertian sentiment is given an Ovidian quasi-legal flavour: 'The adjective *legitimus* is introduced to poetry by O., who uses it 16 times [and nine times in the sense 'to do with marriage'], another indicator of his fondness for legal terminology; cf. Kenney (1969) 253' (Knox on 5.78 *legitimos . . . viros*).

31–2:
With her husband absent, Laodamia neglects her toilette. Laodamia develops the idea at 37ff.: see n. For the phrase *pectendos praebere* [sc. *ancillae, ornatrici* or sim.] *capillos*, cf. *Ars* 3.235 and *Met.* 13.738.

Arethusa too found no need for elegant attire once her husband had departed for war:

> nam mihi quo Poenis nunc purpura fulgeat ostris
> crystallusque meas ornet aquosa manus?
> (Propertius 4.3.51–2)

But our couplet may engage with a further intertext. F. Jouan (1966) 320 notes that Laodamia's dishevelled appearance is paralleled in a fragment of Laevius' lost *Protesilaodamia, FLP* 17 *gracilentis colorem dum ex hoc gracilans fit*, and at Nonnus *Dionysiaca* 24.192–5, where a widowed Indian girl is termed a second Laodamia:

> ἄλλη ποικιλόδακρυς ἀνεστεναχίζετο νύμφη
> νυμφίον ἀρτιχόρευτον ἐοικότα Πρωτεσιλάῳ,
> ἄλλη Λαοδάμεια· νεοζεύκτοιο δὲ νύμφης
> ἄπλοκος ἀκρήδεμνος ἐτίλλετο βότρυς ἐθείρης.

Jouan suggests that such descriptions might derive from the appearance of a dishevelled Laodamia near the beginning of Euripides' play. However, it seems plausible that Ovid's image of Laodamia with her hair uncombed draws on a representation in art. At Ovid *Ars* 3.137–8 *longa probat facies capitis discrimina puri:/sic erat ornatis Laodamia comis*, the heroine is a model for a hairstyle whereby the hair is allowed to hang loose either side of a central parting (*capitis discrimina puri*). The two other models in that passage are famous artistic representations: Apollo with his lyre (*Ars* 3.141–2; cf. *LIMC* s.v. *Apollon* 82–238) and Diana the huntress (*Ars* 3.143–4; cf. *LIMC* s.v. *Artemis/Diana* 17–36). It is likely that a statue representing Laodamia with hair loose was known to Ovid; it is to this statue that he alludes not only at *Ars* 3.137–8, where the loose hair is interpreteted as a style (138 *ornatis . . . comis*), but also at *Her.* 13.31 (and perhaps at *Ars*

3.783–4; but see 35n. *Phylleides*) where it is interpreted as the result of lack of care.

33–4:
Laodamia compares her agitation with that of a maenad. On *pampinea . . . hasta*, = the thyrsus, see Palmer. *Bicorniger* is a *hapax legomenon*; but it is patent that Ovid means Bacchus: cf. *bicornis* and *corniger*; and see e.g. J.E. Sandys (1900) on Euripides *Ba.* 100 ταυρόκερων θεόν.

Agitated women are commonly compared with Bacchants (A.S. Pease (1935) on Virgil *Aen.* 4.301); yet the simile may have special relevance here. There is evidence to suggest that Euripides' play contained a scene where Laodamia worshipped a statue of Protesilaus in Bacchic rites. At Statius *Silv.* 2.7.120ff., the poet prays that the dead Lucan might be granted a day to visit his grieving widow Polla, adding (122–127):

> solet hoc patere limen
> ad nuptas redeuntibus maritis.
> haec te non thiasis procax dolosis
> falsi numinis induit figura,
> ipsum sed colit et frequentat ipsum
> imis altius insitum medullis.

See H.-J. van Dam (1984) *ad loc.*:

> St[atius] means Protesilaos. . . . There exists a story that Laodamia possessed an image of her dead husband, which she surrounded with a Dionysiac cult. St. is the first author to mention it explicitly . . . but it seems to be much older: the image of Protesilaos was already important in Euripides' play. . . . Ovid alludes to Laodamia's Bacchic frenzy before she knows of Protesilaos' death: Ep. 13.33–4. . . .

He cites also Philostratus *Imagines* 2.9.5:

> ἄπεισι δὲ [sc. Πάνθεια] οὐχ ὥσπερ ἡ τοῦ Πρωτεσίλεω καταστεφθεῖσα οἷς ἐβάκχευσεν, οὐδ' ὥσπερ ἡ τοῦ Καπανέως οἷον θυσίας σταλεῖσα

That passage, it seems to me, not only suggests a Euripidean source, but also pinpoints the exact context in which Laodamia performed her Bacchic rites. The description of Evadne (ἡ τοῦ Καπανέως) refers to Euripides *Supp.* 1054ff.; one may speculate that the accompanying description of a garlanded Laodamia similarly refers to a scene in Euripides, the scene being that in the *Protesilaus* which leads up to Laodamia's suicide—hence Philostratus' point of (negative) comparison,

ἄπεισι ('dies', 'departs'). In addition, two sarcophagi (*LIMC* s.v. *Protesilaus* 26 and 27) depict Laodamia with Dionysiac accoutrements (cf. *LIMC* s.v. *Protesilaus* p. 560).

Ovid incorporates the motif of the statue at 153ff., but the point there is that it resembles Protesilaus extremely closely (153–4); Ovid's Laodamia does not venerate Protesilaus as Dionysius. That element of the myth, Laodamia's Bacchic rites, is cleverly and unobtrusively incorporated in our couplet.

35 Phylleides:

So Dörrie, I suspect rightly. His apparatus is silent: in fact, the paradosis is *Phylaceides*, printed by Ehwald, Shuckburgh, and Goold. Cf. Planudes' Φυλακηΐδες. *Phylleides* is Heinsius' conjecture: the main text of P contains something barely legible, but resembling *Phylleides* (*Phylaides* according to Heinsius; *Phyleides*, Palmer and Goold; *Phyliede*, Bornecque/Prévost; *Phyleide*, Giomini. There is agreement that the margin displays the paradosis). Giomini also claims *Phylleides* as the reading of one other ms.

Phylaceides and *Phylleides* both fit the requirements of sense (Phylace and Phylos are both towns in Thessaly) and of metre. Heinsius and Palmer give lengthy discussions on the merits and demerits of each.

Phylake is the city of Protesilaus (cf. 1–2n.); *matres Phylaceides* would be the matrons of that kingdom. That *Phylaceis* is unparalleled in the sense 'a woman of the kingdom of Phylake' is in itself no difficulty: cf. the adjective *Phylaceius* of Laodamia herself at *Trist.* 5.14.39 *coniunx Phylaceia.* However, the use of *Phylaceis* to mean 'descendant of Phylacus' at Apollonius Rhodius 1.47 Ἀλκιμέδην Φυλακηΐδα (cited by Heinsius and Palmer) and at Statius *Silv.* 5.3.273 *Phylaceida umbram* (cited by Palmer) may cast minor doubts on its use here in a different sense.

Phylleides ('women of Phyllos') does not occur elsewhere, but Heinsius cites *Met.* 12.479 *nudaque Phyllei iuvenis ferit ora sarisa* of an assault on the Thessalian Caeneus: 'so ist Phylleus für Ovid gleichbedeutend mit "thessalisch"', Bömer (1969–1986) *ad loc.* Heinsius also compares Φυλλεῖς, used by Stephanus Byzantius of the inhabitants of Phyllos. Palmer speculates that *Phylleides* in our line would not be simply a general term ('Thessalian'), but rather that Phyllos is Laodamia's home town. He arrives at this conclusion by identifying the heroine's father Acastus (25) with Acastus son of Pelias; but cf. 25–6n. on the uncertainty of such an identification.

There appears to be little to choose between *Phylaceides* and *Phylleides.*

It is 'out of deference to the authority of P' (presumably of its marginal reading) that Palmer follows Heinsius in favouring the latter. Argument on ground of *difficilior lectio* supports *Phylleides*. Goold agrees with Palmer's assertion that 'Phyllos was a well-known town . . .', but many would not (e.g. Bömer (1969–1986) on *Met.* 12.479 'Phyllos ist der Name einer wenig bedeutenden und in der Klassichen Literatur sonst nicht genennten Stadt in Thessalien . . .'). While mss. are capable of making anything of proper names, it is somewhat odd that a recognizable rendering of *Phylleides* should have crept into the tradition.

Ars 3.783 provides a further piece of evidence to be taken into consideration. Ovid advises his female pupil to loosen her hair during lovemaking, *ut Phylleia mater*. Heinsius, in his note on our line, takes the *Phylleia mater* to be Laodamia. If Heinsius were right, *Phylleides* for the advisory band of women in our line would gain credebility. But the *Phylleia mater* cannot, I think, be Laodamia. It is true that, as Heinsius says, Laodamia 'comis praecipue conspecta habebatur': cf. 31–2n. But *mater* is a strange designation for Laodamia. *mater* is, however, used of Bacchants (*TLL* s.v. *mater* 439.3–5), and Bacchants are in Ovid frequently a paradigm of windswept hair (e.g. Knox on 10.47). But, then, why *Phylleïa*? Bacchants commonly attract the epithet 'Thracian' (e.g. Bömer (1969–1986) on *Fast.* 4.458), but not 'Thessalian'. Micyllus offers two alternative explanations: either *Phylleia mater* is a particular woman from Phyllos, whose story has not been handed down to us; or she is a Maenad, and *Phylleia* is derived not from Phyllos but from the Thracian territory of Phyllis. Micyllus himself favours the former explanation, Bömer (*Met.* 12.479) the latter, citing Herodotus 7.113.2 on *'der Landschaft Phyllis'*. If the reader of our line could be expected to know that a 'mother from Phyllos/ Phyllis'[5] was a Bacchant, as the reader of *Ars* 3.783 may have been expected to know, then *matres Phylleides* could be taken as a further reminder of Laodamia's Bacchic rites (33–4n.).

36:

This short utterance comes with minimal explanation: it is not stated who are the *matres Phylleides*, nor the occasion for their gathering (35 *conveniunt*). Ovid's reader may have needed no explanation: some

[5] *Phylleia* and *Phylleides* may each refer to both places. Bömer asserts that *Met.* 12.479 *Phylleus* is a different form from *Ars* 3.783 *Phylleius*; but he admits that such an assertion is 'im Gegensatz zu häufiger Praxis des Dichters.'

scholars argue that these women formed the chorus of Euripides' *Protesilaus* (cf. Jacobson (1974) 198). The preceding lines have reminded the reader of Laodamia's worship of her husband in Bacchic rites, as depicted in Euripides' play (33–4n., 35n.); one might speculate that the women's request of Laodamia here alludes to a similar request in Euripides, made in the context of her Bacchic adoration of Protesilaus' statue, asking her to exchange her Bacchic robes for those befitting her royal status: Jacobson loc. cit. compares a similar request from a Euripidean chorus at *El.* 190–2.

37–40:

Laodamia cannot be expected to wear opulent clothing while her husband engages in the life of a soldier—cf. Ovid's cheeky argument linking the dowdiness of the Homeric heroines with their unsophisticated soldier husbands, *Ars* 3.107ff. *saturatas murice* denotes high opulence (cf. e.g. *Met.* 11.166, of Apollo's cloak), and may recall the famous 'twice-dyed' (δίβαφος) fabrics. In 37–8, two unrelated activities, wearing purple and besieging Troy, are linked by means of a pun on *gero: vestes gero* = 'wear clothes' (*TLL* s.v. *gero* 1930. 43ff.); *bella gero* = 'wage war' (*TLL* s.v. *gero* 1942. 83ff.). Cf. Jacobson (1974) 199, 'As always, Ovid cannot give up a clever play on words: *geram . . . vestes/bella . . . gerat* (37–38)'. This play on words is not merely 'clever', but crucial to the point.

Conjectures have been made for the paradosis *vestes*. Shuckburgh, Sedlmayer and Goold print *lanas*, found in two mss. by Burman: cf. Housman (1906) 645. J.B. Hall (1990) 281 suggests *telas*, and *tela* (plural of *telum*) for *bella* in 38: this pair of conjectures renders the gentle play on *gero* clumsy and harsh; moreover, while *tela* may be used of the cloth on the loom (*OLD* s.v. *tela* 1), not until Statius is the word used of a finished garment (*Silv.* 2.1.129, with Van Dam (1984) *ad loc.*). Burman's *laenas* is a nice suggestion (not mentioned by Dörrie): the *laena* (a woollen cloak) could be dyed with *murex*, as here (Virgil Aen. 4.262 *Tyrioque ardebat murice laena*), and was suitable attire for a woman (Servius there comments *quidam muliebrem vestem quasi amatori aptam volunt*). A route of corruption from *laenas* to *vestes* might be imagined: *laenas*, written as *lenas*, would easily become *lanas*, and might then be glossed as *vestes*.

These conjectures for *vestes* were made to avoid unwelcome repetition with 40 *vestes*; but such repetition may be fine (cf. 11.101n. *muneribus . . . conubia donas*). Moreover, there may be no repetition in

any event: I suggest that 39–40 is an interpolation. The point of 37–8 lies with the pun on *gero*; 39, however, simply contrasts two activities linked by a common theme—the adornment of the head. The point seems weak, and undermines the wit of 37–8. 40 is unsalvagable. Hall (loc. cit.) reasonably objects to *novas*, noting that it is out of keeping with *dura*; and conjectures *leves*, but there are further problems with the verse. For *fero* = 'I wear' I have found no parallel; one might emend to a part of *gero* (*geret* and *gerat* are found in some mss.), but even so 40 gives either a banal antithesis ('Am I to wear new apparel while my lord wears hard and heavy arms?', so Goold) or a clumsy repeat of the pun in 38 (*vestes ferre/gerere, arma gerere*). The interpolator has drawn on the reference to hair and clothing at 31–2. That a genuine couplet had previously fallen out is possible, but not necessary; 37–8 stands well on its own.

scilicet . . . geram . . . gerit [. . . pectar . . . prematur . . . ferat]: Some editors (Burman, Shuckburgh, Palmer, and Dörrie) print present subjunctives (*geram . . . gerat . . . pectar . . . prematur . . . ferat*); others print future indicatives (*geram . . . geret . . . pectar . . . premetur . . . feret*). Ms. readings include both alternatives. For once, the edd. are unable to appeal to P: a piece torn off from the bottom of the page has taken with it 38–40 and almost all of 37. *scilicet* appears to occur (if one trusts the mss.) both where the verb is a future indicative, = 'I suppose x will be the case, will it?' (*Am.* 2.14.7, *Ars* 2.627 and 3.619, mss. give future only), and where it is what Palmer here terms a 'meditative' subjunctive, = 'I suppose I am to . . ., am I?' (*Pont.* 1.5.19–20, subjunctive only). I have found no Ovidian instances of *scilicet* with a third person subjunctive, to support *scilicet . . . gerat . . . prematur . . . ferat*, but a 'meditative' subjunctive in the third person is perhaps paralleled at *Her.* 6.77–8 *dona feram templis, vivum quod Iasona perdo?/hostia pro damnis concidat icta meis?* (*concidat* is given by P and printed by the edd.; the majority of mss. give *concidet*).

The edd. make 37–40 a series of rhetorical questions, punctuating 38–40 with varying combinations of questions marks and semicolons. With the excision of 39–40, I suggest:

scilicet ipsa geram saturatas murice laenas?
bella sub Iliacis moenibus ille gerit! (37–8)

gerit is reported by Dörrie as the reading of two mss. The corruption both to *gerat* and to *geret* is simple after 38 *geram*.

41 quo possum, squalore:

Most edd. print the reading *qua possum, squalore*; better is *quo possum, squalore,* given by several mss. including a second hand in P (not mentioned by Dorrie), and printed by Ehwald. Heinsius and Palmer, who nevertheless conclude in favour of *qua,* cite in support of *quo Trist.* 4.10.112 *quo possum, carmine fata levo.* Palmer explains *quo possum squalore* as '*squalore, quo [uno] possum*'. Cf. *Pont.* 2.10.47 *te tamen intueor quo solo pectore possum,* where the *solus* is explicit.

For *qua possum, squalore,* Palmer translates 'as far as I can, namely, by mourning attire'; but, in fact, if one reads *qua,* the sense of 41f. is more likely to be 'I will be said to have imitated your toils with grim attire, to the extent (*sc.* of grim attire) that I am able': cf. e.g. *Ars* 1.490 *qua*[6] *potes, ambiguis callidus abde notis,* where the sense is more likely 'cleverly conceal your words with ambiguities as much as you can' than 'cleverly conceal your words to the extent that you can, namely with ambiguities'. *Trist.* 4.2.57, *haec ego submotus, qua possum, mente videbo* (= 'being an exile, I will see all this to the only extent that I can, namely in my mind's eye'), cited by Heinsius, would seem to support Palmer's interpretation of *qua possum, squalore*; however, *qua* there is, I think, not the adverb, but the relative in agreement with *mente*; so too at *Her.* 10.135 *nunc quoque non oculis, sed qua potes, adspice mente* and *Trist.* 2.56 (where *solus* is explicit) *iuro . . . hunc animum favisse tibi, vir maxime, meque,/qua sola potui, mente fuisse tuum.* Unambiguous support for *qua* in our line would only come from instances of *qua posse* + an ablative noun that is not feminine singular, in the sense 'to what extent is possible, namely by. . . .' I have found no such instance in Ovid.

A further possibilty is perhaps *quod possum, squalore*: cf. 8.5, Catullus 68.149.

41–2 may contain dramatic irony. Laodamia imagines that she will be remembered for imitating by her attire her husband's toils in war (= *labores*: *TLL* s.v. *2. labor* 793.33–43). In fact, she will be remembered for imitating his death (23–4n.).

[6] Any attempts to adopt the variant *quam* were laid to rest by Kenney (1959) 249, who overcame his expressed embarrassment at even mentioning so false a construction as *quam potes* because 'after all these years it may be thought that *quam* deserves an epitaph'.

43–4:
Laodamia turns her thoughts to Paris, instigator of the war, whom she hopes will do her husband no harm in battle. Such concern for Protesilaus arises, as Laodamia explains in 51, out of the mention of *belli tempora* in 42.

Dörrie, along with all modern editors, has Laodamia address Paris in 43 as *Dyspari Priamide*, a conjecture made by Hubertinus (1490) for the paradosis *dux Pari Priamide*. *Dispari* was found by Heinsius in one ms.; and in another as a *varia lectio*, and in two editions of unspecified date, by Burman, who nevertheless favours the paradosis. Hubertinus cites Homer *Il.* 3.39 (= 13.769)

> 'Δύσπαρι, εἶδος ἄριστε, γυναιμανὲς, ἠπεροπευτά'

Heinsius adds Alcman 24 Bergk (= 26 Farnell) and Palmer compares Euripides *Hec.* 944; note in addition Lucian *Dial. Mort.* 27, where Paris is addressed as ὦ Δύσπαρι by none other than Protesilaus himself.[7]

Dyspari is, as Palmer states, 'certissimam et bellisimam lectionem', and the modern editors are right in printing it. On the formation of the word, see G.S. Kirk (1985) on Homer *Il.* 3.39. The openly hostile, not to say insulting, objections to Hubertinus' conjecture voiced by Egnatius ('ineptum et perridiculum est, quod opici quidam, et male initiati literis, *Dyspari*, ex Homerica Rhapsodia supponendum contendere') and Micyllus ('quasi Ovidius Graece hoc loco, quam Latine loqui maluerit') have given way to acceptance. Nevertheless, these objections raise an important question: is there point to Ovid's resurrection of an unusual appellation in Homer?

The context of *Il.* 3.39 is, I think, sufficient to show that, in our line, Ovid makes use of that passage for his own ends. Laodamia rebukes Paris for starting the war and hints (44) that he is a potential threat to Protesilaus' life; Hector rebukes Paris for bringing disgrace to the Trojans:

[7] It is not fashionable to think that Lucian might engage with any intertext, let alone Ovid: 'as far as learning is concerned, [Lucian] travelled light', G.A. Anderson (1976) 65; cf. M.D. MacLeod (1991) 1 on Lucan's supposed scant knowledge of Latin. Nevertheless, *Dial. Mort.* 27 has the further similarity with our epistle that blame for Protesilaus' death is apportioned to Helen, Paris, and Menelaus in turn.

> τὸν δ' Ἕκτωρ νείκεσσεν ἰδὼν αἰσχροῖς ἐπέεσσιν·
> 'Δύσπαρι, εἶδος ἄριστε, γυναιμανὲς, ἠπεροπευτά,
> αἴθ' ὄφελες ἄγονος τ' ἔμεναι ἄγαμος τ' ἀπολέσθαι'
> (Homer *Il.* 3.38–40)

Laodamia's assertion that Paris' good looks have brought war to the Trojans (43 *damno formose tuorum*) draws on Hector's rebuke that his excellence lies only in his good looks (39 εἶδος ἄριστε). Both Hector and Laodamia allude succinctly to Paris' treacherous seduction of Helen when he was a guest in Menelaus' house (*Il.* 3.39 ἠπεροπευτά; *Her.* 44 *malus hospes*); Ovid adds a characteristic pun on *hostis/hospes* (cf. e.g. Kenney on 17.12, = 17.10 his numbering). Hector expresses the wish that the seduction had never taken place, and in rather graphic terms (40). See Kirk (1985) *ad loc.*:

> 'There is no particular meaning of ἄγονος which makes Hector's wish absolutely logical and self-consistent—it is, after all, a highly rhetorical formulation; but what he wishes is that Paris had not been able to be γυναιμανής (as in 39) and so become involved in disastrous sexual unions (for that, rather than legal marriage, is the implication of ἄγαμος here). Nearly all editors understand 'unborn', nevertheless.'

The wish is toned down by Laodamia, to a desire that Paris and Helen had not found each other attractive (45–6). However, a hint of Hector's wish for an impotent Paris remains. By *iners* (44), Laodamia means 'cowardly' (Palmer cites Horace *S.* 1.7.15, where *inertes* = 'cowards'), but Ovid uses *iners* in the sense 'sexually impotent' at *Rem.* 780; cf. *OLD* s.v. *iners* 5d 'having no sexual capacity, impotent'; J.N. Adams (1982) 46; and 16.369–70, with Kenney *ad loc.*, where Paris himself links his proficiency in battle with that at lovemaking, in rather more flattering terms.

Thus Laodamia uses Hector's rebuke for rebukes of her own. Homer *Il.* 3.38–40 is a famous passage: 3.40 was quoted by Augustus of himself with reference to his errant progeny, the Julias (Suetonius *D.A.* 65). *Dyspari*, though, is essential to mark the allusion.

Laodamia's fear of Paris is misplaced. The slayer of Protesilaus is variously identified (63–6n.), but never as Paris.

45–6:
'If only Paris hadn't been attracted to Helen [the Taenarian wife], or *vice versa*'—an idle wish *post factum*; the pair's mutual attraction, here neatly expressed, is a mythological inevitability (cf. Helen's reluctant admission at 17.182). Laodamia regrets the events that took her

husband away to war. She is motivated by practical, rather than moral, concerns: *maritae* (45) is simply a term of reference, rather than condemnation of the adulterous nature of Helen's affair with Paris; but contrast 131. She seems unaware that, according to Hesiod *Catalogue* fr. 199 and Hyginus *Fab.* 81, Protesilaus himself once contended for Helen's affections.

Taenaria = 'Spartan', through synecdoche: cf. 8.73 *Taenaris* of Helen, and 16.30 *Taenaris*, 276 *Taenaria*, 17.8 *Taenaris* of her homeland; Kenney on 16.21 *Sigeo*. However, the word may here add to the poem's tone of impending death (cf. 23–4n.): Taenaris was a gateway to the underworld (*OLD* s.v. *Taenarius* (a) '(w. ref. to a supposed entrance to the underworld)').

47–8:

The avenger, Menelaus, does not escape Laodamia's censure. In acting to win back Helen, he leads many Greeks into danger.

Chasing after an abducted wife was widely regarded as futile (Palmer cites Herodotus 1.4); Menelaus, who mobilized the attack on Troy because of his abducted wife, thus left himself open to particular criticism: cf. e.g. Euripides *I.A.* 381–4; but contrast e.g. Ovid *Ars* 3.253–4, where, to emphasize the beauty of Helen, the poet deems both Paris and Menelaus sensible in their efforts to keep her—indeed, it is this view that Laodamia herself espouses at 73ff. She is not concerned with presenting a consistent picture of the protagonists of the Trojan war, but rather with the welfare of her husband.

In his vengeance, Menelaus will cause many to mourn (48). For Menelaus as a bringer of tears, cf. the oracle given at Herodotus 7.169. The common motif whereby heroes, or the wars they fight, are termed a cause of mourning to wives and parents (e.g. R.G.M. Nisbet – M. Hubbard (1970) on Horace *Carm.* 1.1.24) is framed in an unusual manner. *flebilis* in the sense 'directly causing tears' is found elsewhere only of onions (Lucilius *ROL* 216 and Varro *Men.* 250) and of scorpion-stings (Cicero *Arat.* 430). Its striking use here may mark an allusion to a work now lost.

Instead of, or perhaps in addition to, constituting an allusion, *flebilis* may arise naturally out of 47 *tu qui pro rapta nimium, Menelae, dolebas,* a minority reading for the paradosis *laboras* (cf. *Rem.* 773 *'quid, Menelae, doles?'*): in his sorrow at the loss of Helen, Menelaus is a cause of sorrow to others; cf. *Met.* 11.345 *'aliisque dolens fit causa dolendi.'*

At any rate, Laodamia arrives at a prediction (48), which may spell doom for herself: she may be included among the many (*multis*).

In the following couplet, she seeks to avert the ill-omen inherent in such a prediction.

49–50:

The mere mention of a terrible possibility might cause it to come about; formulae to counter this are common: *OLD* s.v. *omen* 2b and *TLL* s.v. *omen* 575.31–9; cf. the English 'Heaven forbid,' or sim. So concerned with omens is Laodamia that she employs a particularly elaborate version of the formula to ward off a disaster she has mentioned only implicitly (48); indeed, it becomes clear only from the wish for Protesilaus' safe return (50) that this disaster is his death. Ciofanus, Shuckburgh and Palmer cite parallels for the soldier's custom of offering his arms to a god on his safe return, including Propertius 4.3.71–2 (on the relationship between that poem and ours, see 30n. and intro.). For *redux* as a title of Jupiter (= 'the bringer-back'), see Palmer *ad loc.* and *OLD* s.v. *redux* 1 '(usu. of gods, etc.) That brings or leads back home.'

Jacobson (1974) 202 notes *redux* as the first instance of 'the virtual refrain-like recurrence of words compounded of re-, and meaning or implying a return', and commented on the 'pathetic irony' entailed in the motif, 'for Protesilaus will never return'. The irony may be sharper still: as Laodamia writes, Protesilaus has already returned, but not in the manner she imagined: cf. 105–8n.

51–2:

A run of dactyls accompanies this burst of emotion. Cf. 11.65–6n.

52:

The line draws ultimately on Homer *Od.* 19.204ff., where Penelope's tears are compared with melting snow:

> τῆς δ' ἄρ' ἀκουούσης ῥέε δάκρυα, τήκετο δὲ χρώς.
> ὡς δὲ χιὼν κατατήκετ' ἐν ἀκροπόλοισιν ὄρεσσιν,
> ἥν τ' εὖρος κατέτηξεν, ἐπὴν Ζέφυρος καταχεύῃ·
> τηκομένης δ' ἄρα τῆς ποταμοὶ πλήθουσι ῥέοντες·
> ὣς τῆς τήκετο καλὰ παρήια δάκρυ χεούσης,
> κλαιούσης ἑὸν ἄνδρα παρήμενον

N. Hopkinson (1984) on Callimachus *Hymn* 6.91 and J.C. McKeown (1989) on Ovid *Am.* 1.7.58 cite instances of this simile. It occurs in adapted form in Theocritus and Callimachus, with Homer's strikingly repeated verb τήκω applied to the wasting-away of the body

(Theocritus 7.74–5, Callimachus *Hymn* 6.91–2). It is in Ovid that a Latin version of a melting-snow simile is first found, *Am.* 1.7.57–8 (on the use in the *Her.* of the similes at *Am.* 1.7.54ff., cf. 11.77–8n. and 14.39–40n.). The motif evidently pleased Ovid: he uses it four times of tears (our line and *Am.* 1.7.57–8, *Trist.* 3.2.19–20, *Pont.* 2.3.89; cf. [Ovid] *Ep. Drus.* 101–2), and once of mental anguish (*Pont.* 1.1.67–8). After Ovid, the simile resumes its Hellenistic usage in a gruesome description of melting flesh (Lucan 9.780–2) and in Deianira's account of the action of the sun's rays on cloth soaked with Nessus' poisonous blood (Seneca *Her. O.* 729–30).

In our line, the familiar simile is succinctly framed in a single hexameter, with the neutral verb *eunt* singlehandedly doing the job done by *fluxere* and *manat* in *Am.* 1.7.

Comparison of Laodamia's tears with those of Penelope at *Od.* 19.204ff. may be prompted by the simile. Both heroines weep out of concern for their husband: Penelope thinks hers dead, but he is in fact alive; the reverse is true of Laodamia.

53–4:

All Greek girls hate Troy (cf. 1.3 *Troia . . . Danais invisa puellis*), but according to Laodamia it gives cause for fear even by the sound of its place-names. This claim would have amused Ovid's reader, to whom the names chosen would have been reassuring in their familiarity. All are known from Homer, although Tenedos' fame is probably post-Homeric (McKeown (1989) on *Am.* 1.15.9–10). Simois and Ida are later employed by Ovid in an *adunaton* at *Met.* 13.324–7; and, with the addition of Tenedos, to mark the longevity of Homer's fame at *Am.* 1.15.9–10. Laodamia does her best to render these familiar names as harsh in sound as possible, stringing them together into a single, sibilant hexameter. She takes, in this couplet and in the lines which follow, a subjective view of the war and its origins, coloured by her concern for her husband's safety.

55–62:

Laodamia's thoughts turn back to Paris (56 *hospes*), and focus on his abduction of Helen. The picture that emerges is an unfamiliar one:

> . . . the elaborate buildup of Paris, with the reverent description of his great train and personal self-confidence (55–60) is an effective contrast to the traditionally weak-kneed and cowardly Paris.
>
> (Jacobson (1974) 202)

Cf. Kenney on 16.263–70:

> ... [Paris] does not greatly distinguish himself in the fighting, and indeed as an archer was not generally regarded as a 'real' hero ...

Laodamia attempts to create, out of what she has heard of Paris, evidence of the threat that Troy represents to the Greeks in general (62 *Danais*) and, the reader surmises, to Protesilaus in particular. In so doing, she makes use of 'facts' to some extent corroborated by the mythological tradition, but draws dubious conclusions. See following nn. As a result, Laodamia's account of the military threat posed by Paris is as subjective as that given by Paris himself, at 16.353–4:

> finge tamen, si vis, ingens consurgere bellum:
> et mihi sunt vires; et mea tela nocent.

55 nisi si:
Burman's conjecture *nisi si*, followed only by Bornecque-Prévost, is preferable to the paradosis *nisi se*. On *nisi si*, see Heinsius on 4.111; and H-S 2.417, '*nisi si (εἰ μὴ εἰ)* wird nicht selten mit einer gewissen Fülle statt des einfachen *nisi* gebraucht'. The idiom is well-used by Ovid: *nisi si* is printed by modern editors of Ovid at *Her.* 4.111, 17.153, 21.239, *Met.* 5.20, 5.615, 10.200, 14.177, [Ovid] *Nux* 5. Cf. Kenney on 17.151 [his numbering].

There is no syntactical objection to *se defendere*, but *nisi si* makes for neater rhetoric. *rapere* has no expressed object. *defendere* better balances *rapere* if it too has no expressed object: 'Nor would the guest have dared to ravish if he were not able to defend.' For *defendere* used absolutely, cf. e.g. *Trist.* 1.1.25 *tu cave defendas, quamvis mordebere dictis* (but some edd. there print *neu te defendas* . . .). If in our line any object for *defendere* is to be understood, it is not Paris, but Helen. Thus Bornecque-Prévost translates with 'non, il n'aurait pas osé, l'hôte, ravir ce qu'il n'aurait pas pu defendre'. Cf. *Met.* 6.464, of Tereus' plans for Philomela, *aut rapere et saevo raptam defendere bello.*

The corruption from *nisi si* to *nisi se* would have occurred readily. *nisi si* seems often to have caused the scribes problems: variants are found at e.g. all the Ovidian instances of *nisi si* cited above. In our line, given the lack of an object for *defendere, nisi si* would almost inevitably have become *nisi se.*

nisi eam, a conjecture made by Francius (reported by Burman),

removes the rhetorically ineffective *se*, but is extremely weak, and produces a harsh elision (Platnauer *LEV* 84).

56 erat:

> 'Der Indikativ im Nachsatze findet sich nämlich . . . wenn das Verb des Nachsatzes ein Ausdruck des Müssens oder Könnens, der Angemessenheit oder Billigkeit oder ein *Part. Fut. Activi* mit *fui* oder *eram* oder *paene* (*prope*) *c. ind. perf.* ist . . .'
>
> (K-S 2.402)

vires noverat ille suas:

This, of course, will prove to be as erroneous a claim as Paris' own boast to Helen at 16.353–4, quoted under 55–62n. In fact, Paris knows nothing of the actual consequences of his actions: see e.g. Homer's authorial comment at *Il.* 5.64 [of Paris] . . . ἐπεὶ οὔ τι θεῶν ἐκ θέσφατα εἴδη.

57–8:

Paris' sumptuous appearance on arriving in Sparta is evidence of Trojan resources—an attractive but suspect assertion. That Paris was *multo spectabilis auro* (on *spectabilis*, an Ovidian coinage, see e.g. McKeown (1989) on *Am.* 1.8.59) when he abducted Helen is established mythological fact, hence *fama est* (cf. 3n.): cf. Euripides *Tr.* 991–2 ὃν [i.e. Paris] εἰσιδοῦσα βαρβάροις ἐσθήμασι, χρυσῷ τε λαμπρὸν ἐξεμαργώθης φρένας, to which Ovid may be alluding directly in our lines (cf. 61 2n.); Euripides *I.A.* 74 χρυσῶι δὲ λαμπρός; and Horace *Carm.* 3.3.25–6 *iam nec Lacaenae splendet adulterae/famosus hospes*. But 58 is not simply a statement that Paris was well-dressed—although *Phrygiae vestes* were regarded as particularly opulent (e.g. *Met.* 6.165–6 *ecce venit comitum Niobe celeberrima turba,/vestibus intexto Phrygiis spectabilis auro*). Laodamia employs a verbal pun to suggest a connection between the wealth Paris carries on his person (*OLD* s.v. *ops* 4 '(usu. pl.) Financial resources, wealth, property') and his country's military capability (*OLD* s.v. 3 'The means one has at one's disposal for a purpose, resources (military, economic, etc.)' and 1c '*military strength; (quasi-concr.) forces, troops*'. For one's dress as evidence of the resources at one's disposal, cf. e.g. *Ars* 3.172 *quis furor est census corpore ferre suos?*; but the idea that Paris' golden clothes make him a fearsome opponent is flawed. Cf. 61–2n.

59:
The ships and men that accompanied Paris to Sparta may, Laodamia hints (*per quae fera bella geruntur*, 'by means of which fierce wars are waged'), be deployed in battle against Protesilaus. That Paris took with him a *classis* is confirmed by 1.5–6, *o utinam tum, cum Lacedaemona classe petebat,/ obrutus insanis esset adulter aquis!* Cf. 16.107–10 and Homer *Il.* 3.444 ποντοπόροισι νέεσσιν; among Paris' companions on the voyage was, according to one tradition, Aeneas (Dictys Cretensis *Bel.* 1.3; Proclus' summary of the Cypria, *EGF* p. 31 lines 13–15). However, Laodamia is somewhat naïve in considering a private retinue sufficient to wage a war (60 suggests her own awareness of that fact, and attempts to circumvent it: see n.). To explain Laodamia's description of Paris as *classe virisque potens,* one need not postulate that some lost text such as the *Cypria* assigned Paris an especially powerful retinue: Laodamia's view is coloured by her concern about how her husband will fare against the Trojans. Paris' ships were traditionally held responsible for the Trojans' doom; see e.g. Kenney on 16.107–24, '... the launching of Paris' fleet marks the point of no return for Troy (cf. 1.5–6, Eur. *Hec.* 629–37, Lycophr. *Alex.* 16–27)'. Laodamia's concern transforms them into a force with which to wage a war.

60 quota quemque:
Most mss. have *quemque*, and most edd. print it. A correcting hand in P gives *quotacumque*, which is preferred by Heinsius, Bentley and Goold. Burman and Sedlmayer prefer *quotaquaeque*, which (in the form *quotaqueque*) Dörrie reports as the reading of two mss. In addition, the couplet 59–60 is considered spurious by P.H. Damsté (1905) 41 and by Bornecque-Prévost.

quotus, whether or not compounded with a suffix such as *-cumque* or *-quisque*, generally denotes smallness, not greatness, and that is the sense here. Shuckburgh professes his confusion:

> 'It is entirely against sense for Laodamia to say "Paris came laden with wealth, and with how small a portion of his kingdom"....'

He misses the point, which rests with the fact that 55–62 attempts to establish a relationship between Paris' accoutrements when he sailed to Sparta and the threat posed by the Trojans to the Greeks. 60 is a parenthesis (cf. Ehwald) arising out of 59: 'Paris had many men and ships when he abducted Helen—and they represent only a fragment of his available resources.' Cf. *Pont.* 4.10.23–4:

> nec vincet Cyclops saevum feritate Piacchen.
> qui quota terroris pars solet esse mei?

and *Trist.* 5.1.27–9:

> non haec ingenio, non haec componimus arte:
> materia est propriis ingeniosa malis.
> et quota fortunae pars est in carmine nostrae?

Palmer claims that the paradosis *quota quemque* (which he printed) may be interpreted in either of two ways: general (Palmer paraphrased 'how small a part of the whole force of a kingdom is wont to follow a prince'), or specific (Palmer paraphrased 'how small a number of their subjects followed each chieftain'). The latter interpretation is problematic. Palmer wishes 'each chieftain' to refer 'to the chieftains Paris may be supposed to have had in his train,' for whom see Dictys Cretensis *Bel.* 1.3. This is a great deal of information for the pronoun to convey. One might argue that 59 *viris* denotes chieftains, and that *quemque* pick up *viris* ('each *vir*'), but, paired with *classe, viris* is likely to refer to the main body of men. Moreover, *sequitur* as a lone historic present is somewhat difficult.

If the paradosis is correct, it is better taken as a general statement. *sequitur* is a real present-tense, describing a general rule; *quisque* is indenifinite (*OLD* s.v. 8), 'any (prince).'

-cumque and *-quaeque* are both poor alternatives to *quemque*. Where *quotuscumque* is found (and it is not found in Ovid; Heinsius cites *Med. Fac.* 31, but modern edd. there print *quaecumque* or *cuicumque*), it has a concessive, not, as is required here, interrogative or exclamatory sense—'however small. . . .' *quotusquisque* occurs in Ovid at *Ars* 3.103 *forma quotaquaeque superbit*, 'there are few women who can boast of beauty.' For the sense of *quotusquisque*, see *OLD* s.v. *quotus* 2b 'what fraction of the total is each ~ that? (i.e. there are not many ~ that).' With *pars*, the meaning of *quotusquisque* would need to be slightly different: not 'how few,' but 'how small.' *quota pars* is common in Ovid (*Am.* 2.12.10, *Her.* 6.0b [a disputed initial couplet], 12.91, *Met.* 7.522, *Pont.* 2.10.31, 3.4.41, 3.6.30, 4.10.24, *Trist.* 5.1.29); *quotaquaeque pars* occurs only at Quintilian *Decl.* 335.3:

> . . . dum membra sufficiunt, dum in officio vires sunt. quotamquamque partem habeo viventis?

quotacumque and *quotaquaeque* both leave *sequitur* without an expressed object: Paris can either be easily supplied from context or enter the

text as the relative pronoun (Burman reports the conjecture *quem sequitur* for *et sequitur*); but again one is left with *sequitur* as an awkward historic present.

Printing *quota quemque*, there is no need for excision of the couplet. The point made in 60 is particularly neat and Ovidian.

61–2:

Just as Paris' material resources overcame Helen (61 *victam*) in a figurative sense, so too, claims Laodamia, will they overcome the Greeks in a literal sense (contrast Shuckburgh who takes *nocere* as figurative). The expectation, fostered by the rhetoric, that a part of *vinco* in the pentameter will balance 61 *victam* is thwarted: it is no doubt Laodamia's fear of omens (see intro.) that causes her to shrink from stating that the Greeks will be defeated, and use instead the vaguer *nocere*.

In suggesting that Helen was won over by Paris' appearance and retinue (61 *his* and 62 *haec* refer to the whole of 57–60), Laodamia not only touches on the familiar *topos* of female susceptibility to material goods (on which see e.g. McKeown (1989) on *Am.* 1.10), but also enters the debate over why Helen left Sparta with Paris. At Euripides *Tr.* 991ff. (perhaps signposted by 57 *multo spectabilis auro*: see note there), Hecuba answers Helen's claim of innocence with a counter-claim that Helen was taken in by Paris' good looks and fine clothes. Contrast Helen's own claim at *Her.* 17.67ff. that she is attracted more by Paris' self than by the gifts he offers (although, she says, she's willing to accept the gifts too).

Laodamia here makes a further false connection between Paris' personal attributes and his military capabilities. Overcoming a prospective lover is not the same as overcoming an army.

61 consors Ledaea gemellis:

An elaborate periphrasis for Helen, the *gemelli* being Castor and Pollux, Helen's fellow-hatchlings from the eggs laid by Leda. *consors*, a legal-term favoured by Ovid (*OLD* s.v. 1 'one who shares an inheritance'), here as often elsewhere simply denotes a sibling. See Palmer and Shuckburgh *ad loc.*

The paradosis *Ledaea* is well-paralleled. See *OLD* s.v. *Ledaeus*, whose citations include Virgil *Aen.* 3.328 *Ledaeam Hermionem* and, in Ovid, *Fast.* 1.706 *Ledaeis . . . deis* of Castor and Pollux; note besides *Her.* 16.1 *Ledaea* (of Helen) and [Ovid] *Epic. Drus.* 283 *Ledaeos . . . fratres* (of Castor and Pollux).

Nevertheless, Bentley and Heinsius conjecture, both here and at 16.1, *Led(a)ei*, by analogy with other vocative forms of Greek feminine adjectives. Heinsius adduces no other instance of *Led(a)eis* (nor have I been able to find one in either Greek or Latin literature), but rather appeals to Ovid's *penchant* for Greek patronymics, 'graecis enim patronymicis impense delectatur Noster'. See e.g. Bömer (1969–1986) on *Met.* 5.303 *Paeonis* for copious Ovidian instances of 'feminine Derivata auf *-is*'; and H-S 760 on Ovid's fondness for Greek forms in general.

That *Led(a)eis* is not found outside Ovid is no charge against it: such forms occur in Ovid sometimes without precedent, be they coinages or borrowings from lost (Hellenistic) works; cf. Bömer on *Met.* 1.472 *nympha Peneide*. In our line, *Led(a)eis* might be taken as a noun (cf. 14.105 *Inachi*), rather than as an adjective agreeing with *consors*.

But there seems insufficient reason to call the evidence of the mss. into question here. The ms. tradition for both the single and the double letters seems to deal reasonably well with the nominative case of such adjectives (although there is a tendancy to corrupt *Taenaris* to *Tindaris*); even the more tricky vocative could be managed with little (e.g. 15.100 *Lesbi*, minor variants *Lesba* and *Lesa*) or no (e.g. 16.100 *Tyndari*) corruption. A possible instance of scribal corruption of a Greek feminine adjective is 18.2, where *Sesti*, conjectured by Heinsius and Bentley, is printed in place of the paradosis *Sesta* by van Lennep, Ehwald, Giomini, and Goold; but 18.1–2 may be the work of an interpolator (e.g. Kenney *ad loc.*) and, as Palmer *ad loc.* puts it, '. . . as we do not know whom we may be correcting, it is safer to leave *Sesta* standing'.

The editor is under no obligation to print the same form both in our line and at 16.1; there is no reason why *Led(a)eis* should not be found at only one of these two *loci*: as examples of such adjectives found as *hapax legomena*, Bömer (1969–1986) on *Met.* 1.472 cites *Met.* 1.369 *Cephisidas* and *Fast.* 4.873 *Arethusidas*. At 16.1, the conjecture *Led(a)ei* is attractive, since the Greek feminine patronymic balances the Greek masculine patronymic *Priamides* in the same line.

63–6:

Laodamia has heard tell of someone called Hector, and warns Protesilaus to be wary of him. This most familiar of heroes is to Laodamia only dimly known (63 *Hectora nescioquem*, 65 *Hectora, quisquis is est*). Ovid enjoys exploiting the ironic potential of indefinite pronouns: cf.

91 *nescioquem* and *Met.* 11.721 *quisquis es, et siqua est coniunx tibi*; the 'someone or other' turns out to be the husband of Laodamia and Alcyone respectively. Cf. further 11.28n. In our passage, Laodamia fails to recognize her husband's killer. Among the identities claimed for Homer's Δάρδανος ἐνὴρ (*Il.* 2.701), the warrior who slew Protesilaus as he hurried ashore,[8] is a strong tradition that makes him Hector himself: according to Schol. on Lycophron 530 (= *TrGF* 497) Hector was Protesilaus' killer in Sophocles' lost *Shepherds*, which concerned the arrival of the Greeks in Troy; cf. pseudo-Apollodorus *Epit.* 3.30, Lucian *Dial. Mort.* 28.1, Hyginus *Fab.* 103; and note, crucially, *Met.* 12.67–8:

> . . . et Hectorea primus fataliter hasta,
> Protesilaë, cadis . . .

Jolivet (1992) claims that, with the phrases *Hectora nescioquem* (63), *Hectora, quisquis is est* (65) and *multos . . . Hectoras* (68), Ovid alludes to a long-standing debate over the identity of Protesilaus' killer.

> . . . il ne s'agit pas ici du simple choix d'une version qu' Ovide exploiterait au moyen du facile procédé de l'ironie tragique; Laodamie—ou Ovide—fait sans nul doute allusion aux controverses philologiques et mythographiques autour des différentes versions.
>
> (Jolivet 146)

But one cannot have it both ways. If the reader is caught up in a rhapsodic debate over the Δάρδανος ἀνὴρ, then the Ovidian tension between what the narrator fears (some warrior called Hector) and what the reader knows (that Hector slays Protesilaus) will be missed. There is no reason to think that Ovid knew of any alternative identity for the killer; in the *Met.*, at any rate, the poet-narrator himself states unequivocally that Hector did the deed. Jolivet's thesis concerning 63ff., however ingenious, only clouds the issue.

Lest the dramatic irony pass him by, the reader is provided with a gentle reminder that Protesilaus is killed by Hector. In 66, Laodamia instructs Protesilaus to keep the name of Hector inscribed on his heart. The turn of phrase is unusual. *signo* is almost exclusively used of literal marking; in Ovid, of 38 occurrences in R.J. Deferrari (1939),

---

[8] Eustathius on 2.701 mentions as contenders Euphorbus, Aeneas and Achates; he even suggests that Dardanus is in *Il.* 2.701 not an epithet, but the warrior's name.

cf. only *Rem.* 417 for *signum* in a metaphorical sense. Given that Protesilaus dies by Hector's spear (*Met.* 12.67–8), the combination in 66 of *signo* and *pectus* is suggestive: for *signo* of marking with a weapon, see e.g. *Ars* 2.384, *Met.* 6.670, and 12.125 *signatum sanguine Cygnum*, of what Achilles thinks is a spear wound (in fact, Cygnus is unharmed). 66 is not openly ambiguous—the syntax allows only a metaphorical sense for *signatum*—but Ovid could, I think, have found a less suggestive way of phrasing the idea 'remember Hector' if he so wished.

63–4 was deemed spurious (not reported by Dörrie), by Palmer, Bornecque-Prévost, Goold and H. Isbell (1990). M.D. Reeve (1973) 335 cited this as an example of a spurious couplet whose 'wording is free from objection', and indeed no strong objection can be brought against it on grounds of vocabulary (*ferrea bella Am.* 1.1.28, *sanguinea manus Met.* 1.143), syntax, or metre (on dactylic couplets, cf. 51–2, 11.65–6n.). Palmer's objection was contextual: '. . . unde enim quae dixisset Paris scire Laodamia potuit? libri saepe per epanalepsin interpolantur, ut hic *Hectora* . . . *Hectora*' (Palmer's *ap. crit.*); cf. Shuckburgh *ad loc.*, '. . . the writer has forgotten that Laodamia living in Thessaly was not likely to have heard the conversation of Paris in Sparta.'

Jolivet (1992) 143 thought the British commentators too harsh in their judgement:

> 'Les vers 63 et 64 ont été victimes de l'attitude hypercritique de certains éditeurs anglo-saxons et condamnés, notamment par Palmer, pour ineptie.'

The anaphora of *Hectora*[9] for Palmer the mark of an interpolator, may, as Jolivet argued, be symptomatic of Laodamia's prescient concern. And Paris' statement need not have been heard by Laodamia at first hand, but rather reported by *fama* (57) along with the details of 57–9. Nevertheless, there are objections against 63–4 to support the 'Anglo-Saxon' view. 65–6 will stand on its own, motivated not by what Laodamia has heard, but by irrational fears that will, in the event, prove founded: the couplet represents, as Jolivet himself suggested, 'crainte obsessionelle, prescience féminine.' Ovid enjoys specifying the source of information (cf. 11.97–8n. *hunc ensem . . . tradidit ensem . . . iste*), but 63–4 is an unwanted rationalisation of Laodamia's fear, mechanical and unconvincing. There is no reason why this

[9] For the repetition of *Hector*, Wills (1996) 262 cites our passage alongside Virgil *Aen.* 6.166–7 and the disputed Manilius 2.3.

piece of information should be placed in the mouth of Paris in particular. Furthermore, why is Laodamia concerned that 'Hector is stirring up grim war with bloody hand'? She is, after all, fully aware that a war is taking place; her concern in 65–6 is with the personal threat to her husband that Hector represents. It is conceivable, but unlikely, that 64 might give the sense 'that Hector is making a significant personal contribution to the incipient war,' with great emphasis on *sanguinea . . . manu* (i.e. Hector is getting his own hands dirty).

Palmer suggests that 63–4 refers to 16.367–8, where Paris writes of his brother's military prowess; but this would seem a clumsy allusion, aside from any considerations of chronology (on the relative dates of composition of the single and double letters, see e.g. Knox intro. p. 6).

63–4 may be an 'explanatory' interpolation: cf. e.g. 5.25–6, with Knox *ad loc.* (23–4 his numbering).

65 si sum tibi cara:

> '*tibi cara.*] Posset & legi, *si sum tibi cura*, ut millies Noster.'
> (Burman *ad loc.*)

cura was conjectured by Bentley and by Burman, and found by Dörrie in a single ms. It was printed by Goold in his edition (cf. his review of Dörrie, Goold (1974) 480). Planudes rendered the line:

> τὸν Ἕκτορα, ὅστις ποτὲ οὗτός ἐστιν, εἴ σοι φίλτρον ἐμοῦ, φυλάττου

It is difficult to say what Latin word is translated by Planudes' φίλτρον (= 'affection'); at any rate, neither *cura* nor *carus*, where they occur elsewhere in the *Heroides*, are so translated.

For *cura* = 'the beloved', see *OLD* s.v. *cura* 8 'a person or thing constituting an object of care.' The usage is, as Burman noted ('ut millies Noster'), very common in Ovid. *cura esse* + dative of person, = 'to be an object of (amatory) concern to someone' is regularly found in Ovid (15.123, 16.96, *Am.* 1.3.16, *Ars* 1.512, 1.555, 2.350, *Fast.* 2.730, *Trist.* 2.574); cf. the idiom *curae esse* + dative (7.75, 17.162, *Am.* 3.2.8, *Ars* 1.624, *Fast.* 4.838), unmetrical here.

However, *cura* should not be adopted in our line. 'If x is a cause of concern to y' is regularly expressed in Ovid with the idiom '*si cura* + x (genitive) + y (dative)' (164, 14.123, *Met.* 12.602, 14.835–6, *Trist.* 1.1.115, 5.2.34; cf. *Am.* 2.16.47 *siqua mei tamen est in te pia cura relicti* and *Her.* 8.15 *cura mei si te pia tangit*), and never (as it would

be here) '*si* x (nominative) *est cura* y (dative)'. Furthermore, *si sum tibi cura* would pre-empt the final flourish of the epistle, 164 *si tibi cura mei, sit tibi cura tui.*

By pegging her instructions to avoid Hector onto the conditional clause *si sum tibi cara*, Laodamia shows that she has misjudged her husband's feelings for her (cf. 7ff.n.), for, in the event, Protesilaus does not avoid Hector (63–6n.).

67–70:
Laodamia warns Protesilaus not to be complacent once he has evaded Hector. There is dramatic irony in 67 *ubi* and 69 *quotiens*. Laodamia affects to assume that Protesilaus will fulfil the protasis of 65 (*si sum tibi cara*) and, heeding her advice (66), get past Hector (*hunc ubi vitaris* rather than *hunc si vitaris*) to fight in several battles (69 *quotiens pugnare parabis*). The reality is quite different: Protesilaus fights only Hector (and, I suggest, that fatal battle has already taken place as Laodamia writes: see intro.). Cf. 63–6n.; and, on *hunc ubi vitaris*, Jacobson (1974) 201, '. . . wasted words: Protesilaus will never get past Hector.'

67 vitaris:
The final syllable of the second-person singular, and the penultimate syllable of the second-person plural of active verbs are likely originally to have been short in the future perfect indicative, and long in the perfect subjunctive. In poetry, this distinction is blurred *metri gratia*. See McKeown (1989) on *Am.* 1.4.31 *reddideris.*

68:
'And believe that there are many Hectors there', a witty expression of Laodamia's concern. Protesilaus is to avoid Hector and, that done, to avoid everyone as if they were Hector. Shuckburgh's gloss on *multos . . . Hectoras*, 'many men as dangerous as Hector', waters down a conceit all the more amusing in view of that hero's pre-eminence among the Trojans—there is only one Hector.

Burman, Ciofanus, Shuckburgh and Palmer make citations for the striking use of proper names in the plural, including Cicero *de Orat.* 2.66.265 *multos . . . Aiaces Oileos*, Suetonius *Jul.* 1 *multos Marios* (cf. Plutarch *Caes.* 1 πολλοὺς . . . Μαρίους), Shakespeare *Richard III* 5.4 'I think there be six Richmonds in the field', *Troilus and Cressida* 5.5 'There is a thousand Hectors in the field'. This last, a reference to Hector's speed and effort on the battlefield, is sufficiently similar in

sense to our line as to suggest direct influence. That Shakespeare had a detailed knowledge of the *Heroides* is clear e.g. from *The Taming of the Shrew* 3.1.28–9, where Lucentio quotes, in Latin, *Her.* 1.33–4. For an entertaining account of the relationship between the two poets, see J. Bate (1993).

69 et facito dicas:
'And make sure that you say . . .' The paradosis is *et facito ut dicas.* Heinsius found *et facito dicas* in one ms., a reading of which he approved ('venuste'); it is printed by Palmer and by Goold in his edition (cf. Goold (1974) 480), and also by Burman, who nevertheless offers his own conjecture *tacito/tacite,* with which cf. Bentley's *tacitus.*

Omission of *ut* (parataxis) after *facio* = 'make happen' is 'extremely common' (Kenney on 16.263–4). Palmer's assertion on our line, 'Ovidius semper in hac formula *ut* omittit, nisi fallor', holds good, with some small degree of qualification: an imperative of *facio* introducing a subjunctive in parataxis is found in Ovid some 66 times,[10] including 30 instances where the subjunctive is second person ('Make sure that you . . .'). I have found only four Ovidian instances where the *ut* is expressed (*Fast.* 5.690, *Met.* 14.731, *Trist.* 1.10.49–50, 3.12.53–4), none of which is with a verb in the second person. Moreover, *facito ut dicas* in our line gives a harsh elision (of *ō* before *ŭ*-) perhaps unparalleled in Ovid; elision of *ergo* before *ŭ*- (*Ars* 1.657, *Fast.* 3.787, *Trist.* 1.9.63 and 4.4.43) would have been felt to be smoother, since the *o* of *ergo* may be naturally short (see Knox on 5.59).

facito to *facito ut* is an easy corruption: cf. 19.182 *sic facito spernas* (so all editors), where Dörrie reports *sic facito ut spernas* as the reading of seven mss.; and cf. *Rem.* 337 *fac inambulet* (variants *fac ambulet and fac ut ambulet*) and 682 *iam facito e multis una sit illa tibi* (variants *face ut, fac ut, fac*).

The conjectures of Burman (*tacito/tacite*) and Bentley (*tacitus*) are more radical. One or other seems to be followed by Isbell (1990), who translates:

---

[10] Among these are two lines from our epistle, 90 *fac . . . eat* and 142 *referas . . . fac.* McKeown (1989) on *Am.* 1.6.3–4, notes that *fac/facito* + subjuctive has a liturgical flavour. It is tempting to speculate that our line constitutes a further allusion to Laodamia's worship of her husband as a god (cf. 33–4n. and 35n. *Phylleides*); but, as McKeown himself concedes, 'The idiom is, however, by no means confined to religious contexts', and Laodamia will later (142) place the idiom in the mouth of another.

'As you put on arms, whisper,
"Laodamia bids caution for her".'

Burman is concerned with how Protesilaus' reputation with his comrades would fare, if they heard him repeating his wife's instructions before each battle ('si haec praedicaret publice Protesilaus, ut ignavus et segnis ab aliis iure argueretur'). But Laodamia has no concern for battlefield decorum; as far as she is concerned, her husband is a lover, not a soldier (82). However, Ovid enjoys such pedantic touches: Hypermestra's soliloquy (14.53–66) is delivered *exiguo sono* (52) in the presence of the sleeping Lynceus; and Laodamia herself makes her prayer to avert an ill-omen a silent one (87 *tacitoque in pectore*). *tacito, tacite* and *tacitus* would each leave a second-person jussive subjunctive, *dicas*, a little awkward after the string of present and future imperatives, but perhaps pointing forward to the third-person jussive subjunctives *cadat, pugnet* and *tendat* (72–3). They merit inclusion in an apparatus (they are absent from Dörrie's). *tacito* would have easily corrupted into *facito*, but, despite Burman's attempts to show otherwise (*ad loc.* and vol. 4.245–6), *tacito* as adverb has no parallel. *tacite* is rare in Ovid (only *Fast.* 1.65 and *Pont.* 4.10.54); the adjective *tacitus* is used in preference. In our line, *et tacitus dicas* would with little difficulty have been corrupted to *et facit ut dicas*, and thence to *et facito ut dicas.*

pugnare:
bellare was found in one ms. by Heinsius. He and Burman adduce in its support places where, they claim, a part of *bello* has been corrupted to a part of *pugno*. For *bello* in Ovid cf. *Her.* 3.122, *Ars* 3.359, *Fast.* 5.573 and *Met.* 5.101. However, retain *pugnare*. From *quotiens* it is clear that Laodamia is thinking of several individual battles, a sense better expressed by *pugnare* than by *bellare*. The alliterative combination *pugnare parabis:/'parcere . . .'* may express Laodamia's emotion as she discusses her husband's entry into battle.

70:
'Laodamia bade me spare her life,' sc. 'by sparing my own': an oblique reference to the familiar 'two lives in one' motif (on which see 11.62n. *duos*), and another pointer towards Laodamia's suicide (23–4n.).

71–2:
The paradosis has the present subjunctive *cadat* (72). *cadet*, the future indicative, was found by Dörrie in one ms., conjectured by Bentley,

and approved of by Madvig (1873) 77, Reeve (1974) 61, and Goold in his edition (cf. Goold (1974) 480). The mss.' *quoque* in the same line has been doubted. Palmer took it closely with *te*, and paraphrased 'you, as well as others, being unwounded'; cf. Bornecque-Prevost, 'si les dieux permettent que Troie succombe sous le soldat argien, qu'à toi non plus il n'en coûte aucune blessure'. Hall (1990) 281 reasonably objected 'Palmer makes an attempt to do justice to [*quoque*] . . ., but the attempt is footling: Laodamia is not in the least concerned about others, only about Protesilaus', and suggested emendation to *te certe nullum*; Francius had already suggested *te voveo nullum* and *te modo non ullum*, and Burman the scarcely grammatical *te quoque, sed nullum*, which he claimed to have found in one ms. Goold printed *quoque*, but did not include it in his translation, 'If it be fated Troy shall fall before the Argolic host, it will fall without your taking a single wound'. Isbell's rendering, 'If Troy must fall to the Argolid forces/let its fall find you **still** unwounded', may have been an attempt to include *quoque*, but if so it is erroneous. In fact, *quoque* makes perfect sense, if one accepts *cadet.* Print:

si cadere Argolico fas est sub milite Troiam,
te quoque non ullum vulnus habente cadet;

and translate:

'If it is ordained for Troy to fall under [*OLD* s.v. *sub* 13] Greek might, it will fall no less if you sustain no wound.'

Laodamia makes in this couplet not a concession ('If Troy has to fall, I'd rather it fall with minimum risk to you'), but a statement designed to dissuade Protesilaus from engaging in battle too keenly. Cf. Reeve (1974) 61, '. . . in view of *quoque* the clause must be a statement . . .' *quoque* belongs not exclusively with *te*, but with the whole phrase *te quoque non ullum vulnus habente*, which qualifies *cadet.* See *OLD* s.v. *quoque* 1 'In the same way too, likewise, no less', and perhaps also 4 '(attached to a wd. or phr. that marks an extreme case) Even, indeed, actually, etc.'

Laodamia's assertion that one man's life won't make a difference may seem a reasonable one (cf. Magus' doomed plea to Aeneas at Virgil *Aen.* 10.528–9 *non hic victoria Teucrum/vertitur aut anima una dabit discrimina tanta*), but there may be dramatic irony here. According to one strand of the myth, the oracle concerning the first Greek to land on Trojan soil (91–2n.) was aimed specifically at Protesilaus:

quod [sc. the death of Protesilaus] scibant Parcae non longo tempore abesse

si miles muros isset ad Iliacos

(Catullus 68.85–6)

Ἐρέσιος δὲ ἱστορεῖ καὶ Πρωτεσιλάῳ δοθῆναι μνήμονα Δάρδανον Θετταλόν, δοθέντος χρησμοῦ Φυλάκῳ τῷ πατρί, ἀναιρεθῆναι εἰ προπηδήσει, ὃ καὶ γέγονε.

(Eustathius on Homer *Od.* 11.521)

According to this tradition at any rate, Protesilaus was as much destined to suffer a fatal wound as Troy was to fall.

73, 73a, 73b, 74:

The almost universally held view is that 73a and 73b are spurious lines inserted between the geniune lines 73–4. Dörrie records five different versions of 73b.[11] The pentameter 73a *ut rapiat Paridi quam Paris ante sibi*, and the hexameter 73b (version I) are deemed genuine by the older editors, including Heinsius, who has a note in their defence; see also M. Sicherl (1963) 206–9. The reason that 73a and 73b have stood or, more often, fallen together appears to be that the, for the most part, highly regarded mss. P, G and W are among those that omit both. But that is to oversimplify the situation. H. Dörrie (1960) 203–6, in a lengthy discussion on our passage, notes that, while several mss. give both lines (cf. Planudes) and some omit both, the tradition for 73a is not identical to that for 73b. According to the apparatus in Dörrie's edition, several mss. give the pentameter 73a, but not the hexameter 73b. Two do the opposite, giving 73b and omitting 73a. Moreover, some mss. omit 74. Among them are three that also omit 73b and read 73a, thus giving:

pugnet et adversos tendat Menelaus in hostes,
ut rapiat Paridi quam Paris ante sibi.
causa tua est dispar: tu tantum vivere pugna . . .

This Housman believes to be the genuine reading, and his argument in support of it is both characteristic and persuasive:

[11] According to Dörrie, they are, with minor variants:
I irruat et causa quem vincit vincat et armis (Dörrie (1960) has *vicit*).
II ictibus adversis poscat sua munera fortis.
III pugnando moliet quantum iam diligit illam
IV arma ferat frigio fraudatus ab hoste maritus
V hostis et invadat thalamos helenamque reducat.

> The hexameter 75 [73b] with its irrelevant antithesis 'causa quem vicit, vincat et armis' serves merely to distract attention from Laodamia's argument. The pentameter 74 [73a] serves just the same purpose as 76 [74], and therefore must be spurious if 76 [74] is genuine. But it may be genuine if 76 [74] is spurious; and surely 74 [73a] is much the better and more Ovidian pentameter of the two. . . . The true pentameter *ut rapiat* . . . was early lost and its place supplied by *hostibus e* . . .: this stage appears in P G V [= Dörrie's P G W]. Later, the true pentameter was written in the margin; but then, in the copy from which most of our MSS descend, it was inserted, not instead of the false pentameter, but beside it, and an hexameter was manufactured to stand between them.
>
> (Housman (1897) 201)

What Dörrie found in the mss. supports Housman's argument. Some appear to preserve the stage at which both pentameters had entered the text but, as yet, no hexameter had been inserted between them (cf. Dörrie (1960) 205). Others contain a version of 73b, but in the margin, perhaps an indication of a later insertion (in all of these except one, the *ap. crit.* in Dörrie's edition reports that the marginal 73b was supplied by a second hand).

Housman is, I think, right to consider 73b spurious. Versions II–V are intolerably weak; version I is better, but nonetheless indefensible. The balance between victory by *causa* and victory by *arma* on which the line turns is paralleled in Ovid, at *Ars* 1.201 *vincuntur causa Parthi: vincantur et armis* (cf. Merklin (1968) 484); but the point there, that the Parthians have all but lost the battle before it is fought, is irrelevant for our passage. Dörrie (1960) 204–5 likes *causa . . . vincit, vicat . . . armis*; but dislikes the repetition 73 *causa* 75 *causa*. Similar repetitions in similarly disputed passages are variously claimed either as a peg on which the interpolator hung his invention, or as an explanation for the loss from some mss. of a genuine verse, by the process commonly termed *sauter du même au même*. Here, the former is more likely; that 73b *causa* and 75 *causa* have different senses makes the repetition ungainly.

Merklin (1968) 484 complains that to contest the authenticity of 73bI is to 'das Talent mittelalterlicher Interpolatoren dem Genie Ovids gleichzusetzen.' But the verse requires no genius. It seems likely that 75 *causa* reminded the interpolator of *Ars* 1.201.

If 73b is spurious, then either it is has replaced a genuine hexameter, or else one or other of the pentameters 73a and 74 is also spurious. Housman thinks 73a genuine and 74 spurious: he is, I

think, justified; but the justification he himself gives, '. . . surely 74 is much the better and more Ovidian pentameter of the two', (1897) 201, is in need of expansion.

74 forms a logical bridge between the hexameters 73a and 75 (Dörrie (1960) 204), but is couched in unhelpful rhetoric. 'It is a husband's job to seek out his wife from amidst the enemy'[12] assigns to Menelaus a reason for fighting that is lacking to Protesilaus. 74 *nupta . . . viro*, however, makes for an unwelcome contrast with 76 *dominae. dominae* of a wife presents no problem (*TLL* s.v. *Dominus (Domina)* 1938.35–41 and 1939.12–39), but *nupta—dominae* would naturally be taken as an antithesis, wife—mistress; 76 *pios* is, I think, insufficient to counter this antithesis. Laodamia's point is that Menelaus' wife must be reclaimed, whereas Protesilaus' wife is still his own; not that Menelaus has a *nupta*, whereas Protesilaus has a *domina*. The epanalepsis *hostes/hostibus* (73–4) may effectively stress that Menelaus, unlike Protesilaus, is fighting against personal enemies; alternatively, it may simply reveal the mechanics of interpolation. 74 explicitly contradicts 47 . . . *pro rapta nimium, Menelae, laboras*; this is no objection to 74, provided that 74 is necessary to Laodamia's argument: Laodamia is not interested in consistency (cf. e.g. her inconsistent characterisation of Paris). In fact, there is no need for her to justify Menelaus' motives; she need merely say that Menelaus and Paris are embroiled in a private feud that has nothing to do with Protesilaus. And that is precisely what is expressed with Ovidian brevity in 73a. Let Menelaus play his tug of war with Paris; Protesilaus should fight only in defence. 73a and 74 produce word-play that underlines the difference: *Paridi . . . Paris . . . dispar*. Cf. 43 *Dyspari*.

Dörrie (1960) 204 makes two grammatical objections to 73a: *sibi* for *ei ipsi*; and the dative (*Paridi*) after a part of *rapere*. Both objections can be countered. The use of the reflexive pronoun or adjective in a subordinate clause to refer to the subject of the main clause (or *vice versa*) is regular practice in Ovid (Bömer (1969–1986) on *Met.* 15.818–9; see further E.A. Hahne (1963)). Dörrie's contention (loc. cit.) that

[12] *viro* is best taken as 'husband', with the line expressing a general precept. Contrast Dörrie (1960) 205, who ultimately condemns 74 because of what he takes as *viro* = *huic/illi*:

> Wahrscheinlich ist der Pentameter 74 shwer verdebt, vielleicht gar unecht, denn auf ein *huic* oder *isti* oder *illi*, das *viro* zu stützen hätte, würde Ovid bestimmt nicht verzichtet haben.

the 'pointierter Antithese' makes *sibi* awkward seems desperate. For *rapio* + dative of person from whom, or to the disadvantage of whom, something is snatched, see e.g. Statius *Silv.* 1.4.94–5 *hunc* [= Gallicus] *igitur, si digna loquar, rapiemus iniquo,/nate, Iovi* [= 'from Pluto', Jupiter of the underworld], and cf. Sicherl (1963) 206–7. A further objection to 73a, made by Ehwald, is refuted by Housman (1902) 444:

> . . . Mr. Ehwald comments ". . . ich glaube, dass dem Zusammenhang nach *petenda viro est* unentbehrlich und der metrische Fehler *Paridi* ein sicherer Beweis für die Interpolation ist." The same "metrische Fehler" is therefore "ein sicherer Beweis für die Interpolation" of her. VIII 20 [22] "nupta foret *Paridi* mater ut ante fuit" and remed. 711 "utraque formosae Paridi potuere videri". I sometimes wish that Ovid's editors, instead of editing Ovid, would read him.

Dörrie (1960) 205 concludes his discussion by advocating a further possibility: 73a, 73b and 74 may all be spurious, a genuine pentameter having fallen out of the text. Such speculation, however, is not required: 73a suits sense and context well, and to return finally to Housman, seems 'Ovidian'.

73 possid<u>et et</u>:
With the jingle, cf. 11.18n., 13.99, 14.73.

75 causa tua est dispar:
Heinsius' suggestion *causa tuae dispar*, '[his] case [is] different to yours', is difficult without an adjective or genitive noun for *causa*: contrast e.g. 20.158 *non erit idcirco par tua causa meae*, which Heinsius himself cites. The conjecture nevertheless merits mention.

tu tantum vivere pugna:

> . . . *pugna* is here used in a kind of double meaning: (1) join in the battle, (2) struggle to do so and so
>
> (Shuckburgh *ad loc.*)

= *OLD* s.v. *pugno* 1 and 5 respectively.

76:
Cf. the last line of Sulpicia [Tib.] 3.9 *et celer in nostros ipse recurre sinus.* Note that the first line of that poem bears some correspondence to the next line of ours: *parce meo iuveni, seu quis bona pascua campi. . . .* Although the *sinus dominae* as a place of safety for the lover is a *topos*

(e.g. 15.95, *Trist.* 4.8.11–2), direct allusion is possible, given the positions of the corresponding lines.

On *-que* suffixed to prepositions, see e.g. Bömer (1969–1986) on *Met.* 3.440 *perque.*

P had *pius* before correction to the paradosis *pios. pius* (adjective for adverb, 'dutifully') is printed by Ehwald. Keep *pios.* The hyperbaton *inque pios . . . sinus* is a good example of poetic 'sandwiching': the loving embrace embraces the line. *inque . . . dominae . . . sinus,* on the other hand, while admissible (on 'tmesis . . . between "governing" preposition and "governed" substantive' see Platnauer *LEV* 97–103) places undue emphasis on *pius,* coming as it does between preposition and possessive genitive.

77–8:

Laodamia again appeals to the 'two lives in one' motif (cf. 70n.), here worded to suit the context of death in battle, and, with amusing incongruity, asks the Trojans to concentrate their attacks on all but Protesilaus. With *de tot . . . unus,* cf. 2.43–4, 5.82, 14.1 and 73, *Met.* 1.325 and 326, 4.418–9, 13.241, *Trist.* 2.495. See Bömer (1969–1986) on *Met.* 4.418–9, '*de tot . . . una* scheint eine ovidische Eigenart zu sein. . . .'

In our passage the phrase contains dramatic irony: Protesilaus' uniqueness lies not in his being spared, but in his being the first to die.

79–82:

Laodamia's attempt to excuse her husband from the fighting reaches its rhetorical climax in 82, with the claim that Protesilaus is a lover, not a soldier. Cf. 17.256 *bella gerant fortes! tu, Pari, semper ama!*; in our lines, though, the assertion is comic in its subjectivity: Protesilaus seems usually to have been regarded as a soldier *par excellence.* See e.g. *Am.* 2.6.41–2, where he is paired with Hector (his killer—cf. 63–6n.) as a great man who died too young:

> tristia Phylacidae Thersites funera vidit,
> iamque cinis vivis fratribus Hector erat

Cf. Eustathius on Homer *Il.* 2.700–2, where Protesilaus' swift approach towards the Trojan shore is said to have given him a (posthumous) reputation for bravery:

> . . . τῷ Πρωτεσιλάῳ, οἷα φιλέλλην οἰκτιζόμενος, ἔτι δὲ καὶ θαυμάζων τοῦ θάρσους. . . .

The activity of 79–80, which Laodamia deems foreign to his character (79 *non est quem deceat*), is in fact an accurate description of his actions on arriving at Troy. Cf. Jacobson (1974) 208, '[Laodamia] constructs her own world (77ff.) in which Protesilaus is no soldier at all and fancifuly proclaims, *bella gerant alii: Protesilaus amet!* (82).' Inasmuch as her picture of a war-shy Protesilaus jars against the familiar portrayal of Protesilaus the warrior, Ovid's Laodamia is misguided.

Laodamia's own rhetoric leads her astray. Palmer considers 80–1 an interpolation: '. . . spurii videntur. nam *fortiter amare* putidiusculum est: et inanis repetitio vocis *amet* in 84 non toleranda.' But 'empty' repetition need not be problematic (cf. 11.101n.); and *fortius . . . amare* is not mere affectation, as Palmer suggests ('putidiusculum'), but rather contributes to a witty conceit. Elegiac undertones in 79–80 contribute to Laodamia's argument that military activity is not suitable for a lover like Protesilaus. They are present esp. in *nudo* (a carefully-chosen synonym for the *stricto* at e.g. Virgil *Aen.* 10.715 *stricto concurrere ferro*), *concurrere*, and *oppositos*. Cf. *Ars* 3.5 *non erat armatis aequum concurrere nudas*, where erotic undertones in *armatis*, *concurrere* and *nudas* justify the military metaphor by appealing to biological fact (in amatory warfare, there is an obvious sense in which men are 'armed' and women 'unarmed'). For *doubles entendres* involving weapons, see Adams (1982) 19–21. In our passage, the undertones work as follows: 'Protesilaus is not the sort to *concurrere* against a *nudus* sword (*ferro* emphatic, closely governed by *non*), or to expose a cruel breast to warriors; rather (it is implied) he is the sort to *concurrere* with a *nudus* woman (i.e. Laodamia), and to expose a loving breast to a woman (i.e. Laodmia).' That this is Laodamia's argument is confirmed by 81: the kind of warfare Protesilaus is best at is the amatory kind. 81 *fortius . . . amare* is not as dry a conceit as it might appear, since *fortis* is found in an overtly sexual sense (e.g. *Am.* 2.10.28; *OLD* s.v. *fortis* 1c 'full of sexual vigour'). Laodamia's misguided argument gives Ovid the opportunity to produce a clever variation on a common motif, the contrast between *militia* and *militia amoris* (on which see e.g. McKeown (1989) on *Am.* 1.9).

79 est:

Palmer prefers his own conjecture *es*, because he considers 79 an argument calculated to persuade Protesilaus, 'argumentum iam nihil pertinet ad Troas: Protesilaum ipsum adloquitur.' Not so. *est* increases the humour: Laodamia asks the Trojans to spare Protesilaus (77),

explaining that he is not cut out for fighting. *es* produces an intolerably clumsy progression from discussing Protesilaus in the third person (77–8), to direct address (79 *es*), then back to third person (81f.). Dorrie prints *es* but, as his apparatus is silent, this is probably a typographical error (cf. Goold (1974) 476, '. . . at 13.79 *es*, a faulty conjecture of Palmer's appears in the text, where the editor intended *est*').

81:
fortius ille potest multo, quam pugnat, amare, given by a small number of mss. including P, and printed by the modern edd., is preferable both to the paradosis *fortius ille potest multo qui pugnat amore* (found with minor variants *quam pugnat* and *cui pugnat*), and to the conjectures of the older edd.—Heinsius' *fortius ille potest multo quum pugnat amore* and Burman's *fortius ille facit multo quum pugnat amore* (difficulties include the ambiguous *multo* and *amore* = *in amore*).

83–4:
Laodamia now confesses (83 *nunc fateor*) what she had omitted from her account of Protesilaus' departure: that she was almost responsible for an unfavourable omen (but cf. 17–22n.). The admission is directed neither at the addressee of the lines that follow, Protesilaus himself (85 *velles*, 86 *tuus*), nor at the addressee of those that precede, the *Dardanidae* (77). Rather, it is simply blurted out in a rush of dactyls (on dactylic couplets with mid-line pause, cf. 14.21n.), and, on the emotional level, follows on comfortably from the impassioned plea of 82. On the ill omen associated with calling back one embarking on a journey, see Palmer on 133 (135 his numbering).

83 animusque ferebat:
Supply *revocare*. For *animus fert*, cf. *Met.* 1.1–2 *in nova fert animus mutatas dicere formas/corpora*; Bömer there thinks the phrase 'eine ursprünglich prosaische Wendung, die nur vorübergehend poetische gebraucht worden ist'; if true, it makes Ovid's use of it to open his epic startlingly contrary.

85–6:
The act of stumbling on a threshold when setting out is a familiar ill-omen, often referred to by ancient writers and discussed by commentators (M.B. Ogle (1911) 252ff. gives what he considers to be 'a

fairly complete list of references in Greek and Latin literature'; some additions are made by Pease (1923) on Cicero *Div.* 2.84). No other version of the myth has Protesilaus stumbling on a threshold, and scholars have wondered why it occurs here. Merklin (1968) 487 argues that 83–6 is included in order to give Laodamia motivation for writing to her husband. Jacobson (1974) 209 rightly dismisses this view (although he might have done so more forcefully), and states his own, that the two omens of 83–6 are introduced by Ovid in order to provide further evidence of Laodamia's *penchant* for superstition (on which see intro.). Poets are wont to introduce such ominous details (cf. e.g. Virgil *Aen.* 2.242–3, with Austin (1964) *ad loc.*); but one can go further here. The omens in 83–6 present Laodamia in a considerably better light than they do Protesilaus: Laodamia avoids ill-omen, Protesilaus does not. There does exist a version of the Laodamia myth that centres on an ominous striking of a foot on a threshold:

> quo mea se molli candida diva pede
> intulit et trito fulgentem in limine plantam
> innixa arguta constituit solea,
> coniugis ut quondam flagrans advenit amore
> Protesilaeam Laodamia domum
> inceptam frustra, nondum cum sanguine sacro
> hostia caelestis pacificasset eros.
> nil mihi tam valde placeat, Ramnusia virgo,
> quod temere invitis suscipiatur eris.
> quam ieiuna pium desideret ara cruorem,
> docta est amisso Laodamia viro,
> coniugis ante coacta novi dimittere collum,
> quam veniens una atque altera rursus hiems
> noctibus in longis avidum saturasset amorem,
> posset ut abrupto vivere coniugio . . .
>
> (Catullus 68.70–84)

The entry of Lesbia (if Lesbia she be) into a borrowed house for a *rendez-vous* with Catullus is compared with that of Laodamia into Protesilaus' house. The exact point of contact is not explicit—although it is clear that both women enter the house with amorous intentions (73 *flagrans advenit amore*)—but the two entrances do share an important feature: both indicate that the relationship is in some way doomed. Catullus connects Protesilaus' death with Laodmia's oversight in omitting to appease the gods before her marriage by means of sacrifice, a detail of the myth found only here (that 75–6 refer

to a neglect of sacrifice is a point that has been argued over, Thomas (1978), K.M.W. Shipton (1987)); and he appears in some way to connect the failure of his affair with Lesbia with an unlucky omen perpetrated by her—her placing of her foot on the threshold as she entered the borrowed house for the first time (S. Baker (1960). Ovid's Laodamia has manipulated the Catullus. In Catullus' version, Lesbia commits an unlucky act involving a threshold, and is compared with a Laodamia who unluckily omits sacrifices: the fault is Laodamia's alone; she is the subject of 75–6 *nondum . . . pacificasset*, and she had a hard theological lesson to learn from her husband's death (79–80). In Ovid's version, Laodamia is no longer guilty of an unlucky act: she avoids ill-luck because of her self-control, and the fault is passed to Protesilaus, who stumbles as Lesbia did.

A second intertext seeks to conceal the Catullan version, while at the same time drawing attention to it. At Tibullus 1.3.9ff., a departure scene, the poet describes how he offered various ill-omens as pretext for delay. Ovid verses 85–6 allude to Tibullus verses 19–20 *o quotiens ingressus iter mihi tristia dixi/offensum in porta signa dedisse pedem!*; cf. Jacobson (1974) 209, who also notes Ovid 7 as an allusion to Tibullus 15 *mandata dedissem*. This intertext points up Laodamia's deviations from the Catullus version: in the Tibullus, the lover's departure has divine sanction, unlike Laodamia's marriage in Catullus; Delia had consulted the gods (Tibullus 10 *dicitur*), unlike Catullus' Lesbia (Catullus 75–6).

Ovid has transformed Catullus' Laodamia, so unconcerned with supernatural matters as to neglect a sacrifice to the gods of her new home, into a Laodamia who takes superstition to extremes. Tibullus 1.3 emphasises this too. Tibullus' final instructions to Delia (15 *cum iam mandata dedissem*) are immediately followed by pretended accounts of omens (17–20); Laodamia's final instructions to Protesilaus are broken off (7, cf. 13),[13] and she narrates the omens concerning Protesilaus' departure only now. Tibullus' willingness to invent portents in order to delay his departure stands in contrast with Laodamia's unwillingness to discuss what she feels to be a genuine omen. The allusion to Tibullus at verse 7 sets up an expectation for Laodamia

[13] Ovid keeps the same part of the verb as in Tibullus (Ovid 7 *mandata . . . dedissem*, Tibullus 15 *mandata dedissem*)—a clever touch. Tibullus' pluperfect subjunctive is in a temporal clause, expressing a completed action; Ovid's pluperfect subjunctive is conditional, expressing an uncompleted action.

to mention this omen immediately, in her account of Protesilaus' departure. But, just as she kept quiet about it when it occurred (see 87 *ut vidi, ingemui tacitoque in pectore dixi*), so too does she avoid mentioning it in her letter until prompted by concern (89 *haec tibi nunc refero, ne sis animosus in armis*).

85 cum . . . velles . . . exire:
Cf. the (in retrospect) ill-omened departure of the maid Nape at *Am.* 1.12.3–4 *modo cum discedere vellet,/ad limen digitos restitit icta Nape.* On *velle* = 'be on the point of', see McKeown (1989) there.

87 ut vidi ingemui:
For the elision, see Platnauer *LEV* 76 item 15. *ut vidi ingemui* is preferable to *ut vidi ut gemui*, Heinsius' conjecture. Heinsius on 12.35 [12.33 his numbering] *et vidi et perii! nec notis ignibus arsi* compares Virgil *Ecl.* 8.41 *ut vidi, ut perii, ut me malus abstulit error!*, and follows Egnatius in emending to *ut vidi ut perii! nec notis ignibus arsi*; he also suggests *ut patuit miserae iucundus nominis error,/ut mens ut rediit verus in ora color* for the paradosis *ut patuit . . . et mens et rediit* at *Ars* 3.730, and *ut vidi ut gemui* for *ut vidi ingemui* in our line. Here, V. Loers (1825) 24, who nevertheless argues against Heinsius, reports the ms. readings *ut vidi et gemui* and *ut vidi gemui*, which could both be regarded as an intermediate stage between *ut vidi ut gemui* and *ut vidi ingemui.* Heinsius claims to have rescued *ut vidi ut gemui* 'ex vestigiis veterum librorum'. For the elision *vidi ut*, cf. Platnauer *LEV* 76 item 17. On *ut . . . ut*, and its relationship to the Greek ὡς . . . ὡς (or ὡς . . . ὥς) see S. Timpanaro (1978) 219–87. There is considerable disagreement over both the Latin and the Greek idioms: while the first ὡς/*ut* is generally regarded as temporal, the second (and subsequent) is variously interpreted as demonstrative, = ὥς ('When . . . so/then . . .'), or exclamatory, = ὡς ('When . . . how . . .!'). Of the three Ovidian passages where Heinsius wishes to have *ut . . . ut, Her.* 12.35 would have perhaps the strongest case, being a likely direct allusion to Virgil *Ecl.* 8.41: it is by allusion to this famous Latin example that Ovid is most likely to have brought the idiom into his own poetry. And yet a convincing argument has been made in favour of the majority reading at 12.35, *et . . . et: et vidi* picks up a *vidi* two lines above—a device common in Ovid. See Loers (1825), and cf. Palmer *ad loc.* (12.33 his numbering). It seems likely that Ovid never uses *ut . . . ut*, but rather nor-

malizes Virgil's Hellenism with *et* . . . *et* at 12.35, and with a single *ut* here and at 16.135 *ut vidi, obstupui.* See Timpanaro (1978) 278; cf. Bessone (1997) on 12.35 (33 her numbering). A further point against *ut* . . . *ut* in our line: one might expect the third colon, *tacito* . . . *in pectore dixi*, to be connected not with *-que* but with a further *ut*, by analogy with Virgil (cf. Loers (1825) 89), but that would be intolerably clumsy, with a hiatus (*tacito in*) unparalleled in Ovid.

88:
A prayer to convert a portent of disaster to one of safe return, with *signa* picking up 86 *signa*. The ability to think quickly to avert ill-omens in such a fashion appears to have been a requisite quality for generals in the field (Frontinus *Str.* 1.12, Pease (1923) on Cicero *Div.* 2.84). Usually, the stumbler himself offers the means to a positive interpretation of the fall, usually with a pun on *teneo/ἔχω* or sim. (e.g. Suetonius *Jul.* 59 '*teneo te* . . . *Africa*'; cf. *Le Roman de Rou de Wace* 6579 [of William the Conquerer] '*La terre ai as dous mains saisie*'). In our passage, by contrast, Laodamia attributes no words to the stumbler, and herself offers no explanation as to how the favourable interpretation she prays for might be made. A late Latin text suggests that treading on (although not stumbling against) the threshold was regarded as felicitous (Augustine *De Doctrina* 2.20). It is not impossible that Laodamia is in our line appealing to such a superstition. More likely, however, the prayer is to be regarded as desperate and ineffective. Protesilaus will never return alive (but on his ghostly return from the dead, see 105–8n.).

reversuri:
Burman reports *recursuri* as the reading of one ms., which he prefers, as being appropriate to a voyage by sea. He cites Ovidian instances of the noun *recursus*; but the future participle of *recurro* is not found in Ovid, while that of *revertor* is, among other places, in the line immediately preceding one of Burman's citations (*Met.* 11.453).

89–90:
The cliché *in ventos* . . . *eat* (Nisbet-Hubbard (1970) on Horace *Carm.* 1.26.2) has new life breathed into it by means of a poetic conceit—the exploitation of the etymological relationship between *animus/animosus* and ἄνεμος. See McKeown (1989) on *Am.* 1.6.51 *animoso* . . . *vento*,

who cites ancient discussions on the etymology and examples of *animosus* applied to winds. In our lines, Protesilaus is asked not to be too inflated with military spirit (*animosus*), rather to scatter Laodamia's fears to the winds. Cf. *Met.* 12.469 *verbaque tot fudit vacuas animosus in auras*, of the centaur Latreus, puffed-up with battle-pride.

90:

'Make this fear of mine vanish in its entirety to the winds.' The *timor*, and its intended disappearance, is emphasized by the triple designation *meus . . . hic . . . omnis. hic* serves good purpose, and is preferable to the variants *hinc timor* and *ut timor* (Ovid prefers parataxis after *fac*, 69n.). *meus . . . hic timor = ne sis animosus in armis; hic* makes this connection, and thus sharpens the pun *animosus . . . ventos* (89–90n.). Burman discovered, 'in Vossii excerptis',[14] *irritus in ventos fac timor omnis eat*, a corruption no doubt influenced by the common use of *irritus* in versions of the 'to the winds' motif (*Am.* 2.16.45–6, *Ars* 1.633–4, *Rem.* 286, 678, *Trist.* 1.8.35).

91–2:

'There is an oracle, too, that marks out someone or other for death [the superstitious Laodamia uses the euphemistic *fato . . . iniquo*]—whoever is the first of the Greeks to touch the soil of Troy.' A further reason (*quoque*) for caution on Protesilaus' part. For this oracle, see Hyginus *Fab.* 103, Tzetzes *Schol. ad Lycophronem* 245 and *Antehom.* 248, and Eustathius on *Od.* 11.521. The dramatic irony here is obvious: *nescioquem* proves to be Protesilaus (cf. my remarks on indefinite pronouns, 63–6n.).

But the dramatic irony may be still more acute. *nescioquem* is in tension with *designat*, which implies that the individual is known ('point out', cf. *digito designare* of pointing out someone in a crowd, *Am.* 3.1.19 and 3.6.77). There is a secondary meaning for the couplet, of which Laodamia is unaware: 'There is an oracle, too, that marks out Protesilaus for death.' For the oracle aimed specifically at Protesilaus, see 71–2n. The word-order of 92 seems fairly unassuming (juxtaposition of proper names *Danaum Troada*, internal rhyme *Danaum . . . humum*); but Laodamia makes the unfortunate juxtaposition *primus Danaum.*

[14] The library of G.J. Vossius (1577–1649), and his son Isaac (1618–89), in Leiden. See L.D. Reynolds N.G. wilson (1974) 164, 166.

For the etymology of Protesilaus' name ('First of the people', πρῶτος + λαός),[15] Ciofanus quotes Ausonius *Epitaph.* 12 *fatale adscriptum nomen mihi Protesilao;/nam primus Danaum bello obii Phrygio* . . . and *Epigram.* 41.5–6 *Protesilae, tibi nomen sic fata dederunt,/victima quod Troiae prima futurus eras*, where the name marks him out for the manner of his death, and Hyginus *Fab.* 103 *Iolaus . . . quem cuncti appellarunt Protesilaum, quoniam primus ex omnibus perierat*, according to which his original name was changed to Protesilaus *post* (and *propter*) *mortem*. Palmer notes also *Trist.* 2.403–4 . . . *zquid Thesea, quique Pelasgum/Iliacum tetigit de rate primus humum*, where the relative clause identifies Protesilaus, as does the relative clause in our pentameter. Ovid's Laodamia thinks the oracle a general one; but she unwittingly frames it as directly applicable to her husband.

The mss. in 92 give *tangat*, *tanget*, and *tangit*. Either subjunctive or indicative is possible: the former draws out Laodamia's unknowing interpretation of the line ('. . . whoever touches . . .'), the latter the ominous undertone ('. . . he who will touch . . .'); both interpretations are discernible in either case.

91 nescioquem:
A single word. Cf. Reeve (1974) 63.

93ff.:
See Jacobson (1974) 202 on these lines, 'Every detail of her hopes is played off against the reality that will take place and will be just the opposite in all respects'. The inherent dramatic irony is deftly handled. Jacobson finds 93 particularly pleasing, '. . . a typically fine Heroidean verse. The oracle is seen as it affects the woman; note how *prima* picks up *primus* (92)'. Fine too is the manner in which the line hints at events beyond the scope of the letter: though Laodamia's attention elsewhere is focused on herself and her husband, she here pauses to pity whichever stranger will be the first to grieve for a husband lost in the war; the reader thus glimpses how great Laodamia's grief will be when that stranger turns out to be herself (Laodamia's grief was an element of the myth right from the start: in Homer she was Protesilaus' ἀμφιδρυφὴς ἄλοχος, *Il.* 2.700). Her entreaties

[15] *primus . . . tangat humum* may suggest an alternative etymology, 'first leaper' (πρῶτος + ἅλλομαι); cf. perhaps Homer *Il.* 2.701–2, and see J.J. O'Hara (1996) 10.

that Protesilaus take care to avoid becoming the *nescioquem* of 91 arise naturally out of her fear of becoming the *infelix* of 93; but the reader knows that these entreaties prove tragically fruitless. Laodamia attempts to avoid any possibility of Protesilaus touching Trojan soil first: she warns him to make sure not only that his boat is last to arrive (95f.), but also that he is last out of it (97f.). Of course, he is in fact the first to land. Protesilaus as *primus* is a staple part of the myth; framed against it here is Laodamia's emphatic plea that Protesilaus be last. See following nn.

95 mille . . . millesima:
For 1000 as the number of Greek ships at Troy, see Austin (1964) on Virgil *Aen.* 2.198 *mille carinae*:

> . . . the traditional number by poetic arithmatic, going back at least to Aesch. *Ag.* 45 *στόλον Ἀργείων χιλιόναυτήν*. . . . The exact number of the Greek ships may be obtained by statisticians from *Il.* ii, or from Hygin. *Fab.* 97: but could Helen's face have launched 1186 ships?

Laodamia wishes Protesilaus' ship to be the thousandth. Dictys Cretensis *Bel.* 2.11 states that, in the event, it was the first. For *mille(n)sima*, cf. 14.121n. *centesima*.

96:
fatigatas aquas strengthens *ultima*. The waters are imagined as wearied (*OLD* s.v. *fatigo* 1c '(poet.) to tire (things by constant use, etc., places by traversing them)') by the 999 ships that have preceded Protesilaus'. The sense is slightly different at Virgil *Aen.* 10.304 [*puppis*] *fluctus* . . . *fatigat*, where the ship is stationary, marooned on rocks.

97 praemoneo:
Dramatic irony, perhaps, in the prefix *prae-*: her warning may in fact be *post factum* (for Protesilaus as already dead, see 149ff.n.).

de nave novissimus exi:
Particularly pleasing: it plays off against Homer's νηὸς ἀποθρῴσκοντα πολὺ πρώτιστον Ἀχαιῶν (*Il.* 2.702).

98–9:
These lines, so far undisputed, are, I suspect, spurious. 98 is nonsense in context, if *properes*, the majority ms. reading printed by some

edd., is followed: as Loers (1825) observes, *properes* would give the sense 'You have no native land to rush to'. One might suppose that the *properas* read by W and some late mss. is correct, and that the indicative has been corrupted to subjunctive in the majority tradition; but the bland result hardly seems deserving of such effort.

99 aims to contrast Protesilaus' return home, which Laodamia hopes will be swift, with his landing at Troy, which she hopes will be reticent (95–8). *venies* is intolerably weak for this purpose. Contrast 3–6, where a similar contrast is made effectively.

100, given by the mss. as *inque tuo celerem litore siste gradum*, is uncomfortable in its present task. Laodamia is, one presumes, telling Protesilaus to make his journey home swiftly. *celerem* cannot bear the burden of the required emphasis. The actual emphasis of the line as it stands is not on speed, but on the conclusion of a journey—or, at least, it would be, if *siste gradum* could carry that meaning. Where it is found elsewhere, *sisto gradum/pedem* is used of holding one's motion in check (e.g. *Rem.* 80, Virgil *Aen.* 6.465), rather than bringing a journey to its natural end. The actual sense of 100 would thus be 'Do not, in your haste, hurry on past Phylake'—clearly, not what is required.

There is a context in which Protesilaus might profitably be advised *siste gradum*:—at the moment he disembarks at Troy. The pentameter 100 belongs with the hexameter 97. The comparison of the landing at Troy with the return to Phylake is the work of an interpolator, who either made two small changes to 100 to suit his ends, or else found one or other, or both, already made by scribal error. I suggest that the couplet 97–100 may originally have read:

hoc quoque praemoneo: de nave novissimus exi,
    inque **ipso** celerem **limine** siste gradum.

Just as 96 expanded upon 95, so too 100 expands upon 97. The two pentameters 96 and 100 are both attached to their respective hexameters with the connective *-que*. With 100, Laodamia takes caution to extremes: to ensure that Protesilaus really does embark last (97 *de nave novissimus exi*), he is to pause as he leaves the boat. The echo of 86 *limine* turns that line's rebuke into useful advice: just as he gave an unwelcome stumble against the threshold there, so should he make a welcome pause at the threshold here. The *limen* in 100 is perhaps metaphorical, as at *Rem.* 80; but note that *limen* can be used of the boundary between sea and land (*TLL* s.v. *limen* 1406.39ff.).

The new line of thought begun at 101—Laodamia's distress at being separated from her husband, particularly at night—follows on poorly from the fantasy of Protesilaus' speedy return. Until now, the response to this has been to emend 102 *tu mihi luce dolor, tu mihi nocte venis* in an attempt to smooth the transition from 99–100 to 101–2. Bentley conjectures *tu mihi luce memor/precor, tu mihi nocte veni.* According to Burman, a 'vir, nescio quis, eruditus' conjectured *tu mihi luce celer, tu mihi nocte veni*: this Goold prints in his text, and notes the omission of it from Dörrie's apparatus (Goold (1974) 479).[16] All three conjectures (*memor, precor* and *celer . . . veni*) are unnecessary with the excision of 98–9 and the emendation of 100 described above. Burman argues convincingly against *celer*; and one argument in particular applies to the other two conjectures also: a command in 103 to come home day or night sits awkwardly with what follows. 'You cause me sorrow, especially at night' is far better sense than 'Come home at night' when followed by '. . . because night is when girls should be in their man's embrace' (103–4).[17] If Protesilaus returns during the day, one might expect Laodamia to be content that they would have the coming night together.

101–3:
In her description of the constant distress caused by Protesilaus' absence, Laodamia adopts the grand style, perhaps in imitation of a source (for tragic treatments of the myth, see intro.). The chiastic arrangement of 101–2 plays off lofty periphrases for night (*latet Phoebus, TLL* s.v. *lateo* 996.22ff.) and day (*terris altior exstat, TLL* s.v. *exsto* 1930.75ff.) against their mundane counterparts. In essence, 101–2 means 'Whether it is night or whether it is day, you are a source of pain to me day and night.' Ovid elsewhere employs similar laborious repetitions to humorous effect: see e.g. *Ars* 2.297–8 *sive erit in Tyriis, Tyrios laudabis amictus* where, as in our line to a lesser degree, the lofty tone is out of keeping with the subject matter. Cf. J.-M. Frécaut (1972) 56–7 on such repetitions. In 103, Laodamia consid-

[16] Goold believed the *nescioquis* to be Bentley. Jacobson (1974) 208 asserted that the conjecture *celer* was in fact made by C. Heumann in 1717. Whoever it was who first suggested . . . *celer* . . . *veni*, it was not Fraenkel, though he claimed the conjecture *celer* as his own, (1945) 191; *veni* he attributed to Bentley.

[17] Shuckburgh's omission of 103–4 from his text, without explanation in either apparatus or commentary, is probably simply an error.

ers when her pain is at its greatest, by day or by night—a train of thought which has point, since it leads into the assertion that Protesilaus occupies even her dreams (105ff.). Contrast *Met.* 11.369–70 '*qui* [sc. *lupus*] *quamquam saevit pariter rabieque fameque,/acrior est rabie*', where a similar weighing-up of alternatives generates humour through its pointlessness (cf. e.g. Murphy (1972) *ad loc.*).

102 venis:
dolor . . . venis practically has the sense *dolor es*: on *venio* and *eo* used as near-synonyms for *sum*, see e.g. McKeown (1989) on *Am.* 1.10.30. However, *venis* has been chosen here for its erotic connotations (McKeown *loc. cit.*, Adams (1982) 176, 'A female, viewing herself as the goal of motion, would have used *venio* of a man coming to her'), out of which arises the following couplet: indeed 103–4 *nocte tamen quam luce magis* [sc. *venis*]. *nox grata puellis,/quarum suppositus colla lacertus habet* only makes sense in context if the erotic sense of *venis* is noticed. For pentameters with interchangeable halves, cf. 163–4n., 11.116n., 14.106n.

104:
Such periphrases are commonly employed to describe embraces (see e.g. Knox on 15.127), but the wording here puts one in mind of Catullus 68.79ff., quoted under 85–6n. Ovid's Laodamia is insistent upon the loneliness of the night (102–3 *nocte . . . nocte . . . nox*), when other girls are in the arms of their lover. The reader familiar with Catullus 68 will remember that Laodamia was forced to sever herself from the kind of embrace described in our line (68.81 *coniugis ante coacta novi dimittere collum*, cited by Palmer), before she had properly sampled the delights of the *nox* (68.82–3 *quam veniens una atque altera rursus hiems/noctibus in longis avidum saturasset amorem*). Connection with this passage of Catullus thus re-established (cf. 85–6n.), Ovid goes on to play with the allusion in 109–12 (see n.).

105–8:
At night, Laodamia dreams of lying in her husband's embrace, and is visited by his *pallens imago* (107). Laodamia's dream exists only in this version of the myth. For the motif of the erotic dream, see in Ovid *Her.* 15.123–34, 19.59–64, and *Met.* 9.468–86; and cf. e.g. *Anth. Graec.* 5.2 and 5.243.

The *pallens imago* is generally agreed to be in some way related to

Protesilaus' temporary resurrection from the dead, described in several extant versions of the myth. The nature of the relationship is disputed. Palmer does not consider the Ovidian apparition to be Protesilaus himself returned from the dead:

> [Laodamia] dreams of seeing the ghost of Protesilaus; it is not his actual return from Hades that is referred to; for he has not yet been slain.
> (Palmer *ad loc.*)

Whether he thinks that the *imago* forshadows the actual return of the dead Protesilaus, imagined as taking place after the letter had been written, is unclear. Jacobson, however, states his own opinion clearly. For him, this passage is evidence of Ovid the psychoanalyst: the *imago*, he believes, is neither preliminary to Protesilaus' return, nor, he considers, is it likely to be the retuned Protesilaus himself:

> The ghost is the product of the lover's imagination oppressed by anxiety. Indeed, in this Ovidian reinterpretation, the ghost, nay the myth, becomes the projection of Laodamia's mind. In other words, to assume that Ovid is here eliciting an expectation of the ultimate return of Protesilaus' ghost is wrong. This is Ovid's myth, in 164 lines; the 'ghost' has returned, in the special sense effected by the poem.
> (Jacobson (1974) 212)

Exactly what we are to make of Laodamia's dream and the *pallens imago* is complicated by the fragmentary and contradictory nature of the myth's sources. Two extant accounts of the myth suggest that there was a version in which Protesilaus did not return from the dead at all: one has Laodamia sleeping with a statue of her husband after she has heard of his death;[18] the other appears to present Laodamia as engaging in necrophilia.[19] Other versions incorporate both the statue and Protesilaus' return.[20] Our epistle includes mention of

---

[18] Tzetzes *Chil.* 2.5.759ff.

[19] Eustathius on Homer *Il.* 2.701. Both Tzetzes and Eustathius record in addition a version in which Protesilaus returns from the dead.

[20] Pseudo-Apollodorus *Epit.* 3.30: Laodamia devotes herself to the image; Protesilaus returns from the dead; he descends again; Laodamia kills herself with a sword. Hyginus 103 4: Protesilaus returns from the dead; he descends again; Laodamia devotes herself to the image; the image is thrown onto a pyre, on which Laodamia perishes. Eustathius on Homer *Il.* 2.701: Protesilaus returns from the dead to find Laodamia embracing the image; he descends again; Laodamia kills herself with a sword. Statius *Silv.* 2.7.120–3 seems to show knowledge of both the statue and the return (33 4n.). It is almost certain that Euripides too included both. Fr. 655 Nauck seems to be primary evidence of the role of the statue in Euripides' *Protesilaus*,

the statue, and plays with its role in Laodamia's death (149ff.n.). Ovid's readers would be familiar with Protesilaus' return from the dead—in particular, from Euripides *Protesilaus*[21] and Propertius 1.19.7–10:

> illic Phylacides iucundae coniugis heros
> non potuit caecis immemor esse locis,
> sed cupidus falsis attingere gaudia palmis
> Thessalus antiquam venerat umbra domum.

The *pallens imago*, which Laodamia thinks is a figure in a dream, is, I suggest, to Ovid's reader Protesilaus returned from the dead. *Pace* Jacobson, it is inevitable that the reader will attempt to play Laodamia's 'subjective' version of events off against the 'objective' mythological background. See intro. Laodamia's mention of the statue at 149ff. acts as a temporal marker, signalling to the reader that Protesilaus is to be regarded as already dead (see n.).

What Laodamia interprets as a vision in a dream can be recognised by Ovid's reader as Protesilaus returned in ghostly form from Hades.[22] That the *imago* is *pallens* (emphatic through hyperbaton) is suggestive. For the pallor of the dead, see e.g. *TLL* s.v. *pallens* 124.26ff. and s.v. *pallor* 139.47ff. The *muta querela* (108; see n.), of which

although the exact meaning of the fragment has been disputed. On the depiction of Protesilaus' return in Euripides' play, see next footnote.

[21] Jacobson (1974) 197 'We are fairly sure that [Protesilaus'] resurrection was a major part of Euripides' drama.' Hyginus, who recorded both Protesilaus' return and Laodamia's death on the pyre, may follow Euripides (cf. Nauck p. 563). The scholiast on Aristides 3.671–2D and on Lucian *Charon* 1 both purport to be a précis of Euripides' *Protesilaus*, and both mention Protesilaus' return from the dead. The former introduces the detail of the return with καί φασιν perhaps an indication that this detail is taken from some source or sources other than Euripides; but, at any rate, it is uncertain whether the information given by these scholiasts is accurate (see further R.O.A.M. Lyne (1998) 203). More important are the fragments of Euripides' play. Fr. 647 Nauck, ἄξιος δ' ἐμὸς/γαμβρὸς κέκλησαι παῖδα μοι ξυνοικίσας, was, according to Photius who preserved it, spoken by the character of Protesilaus himself who, it is almost certain, was dead at the play's outset. Jouan (1966) 325 thinks that fr. 654 Nauck, δυοῖν λεγόντοιν, θατέρου θυμουμένου,/ὁ μὴ ἀντιτείνων τοῖς λόγοις σοφώτερος was also spoken by Protesilaus. Most telling of all is fr. 646a Nauck ἕπου δὲ μοῦνον ἀμπρεύοντί μοι, which appears to be a command by Hermes, in his role as guider of souls, to Protesilaus, either as they arrive from Hades, or as they return there. Hermes ψυχοπομπός is depicted accompanying Protesilaus on an A.D. second century sarcophagus (*LIMC* s.v. *Protesilaus* 27, on which cf. 33–4n.).

[22] Some versions of the myth have Protesilaus returned in the form of a ghost (Jacobson (1974) 212), others in full human form (Jacobson 211). Whichever was contained in those treatments of the myth now lost, Ovid might have expected the reader to be familiar with the former from Propertius 1.19.7ff.

Laodamia can make no sense, may engage with a dramatic speech, perhaps in Euripides' play, made by the returned Protesilaus to his wife. The erotic dream (105–6) is to the reader the love-making in which the couple indulged before Protesilaus was led a second time to Hades.[23]

Ovid may have borrowed the idea of connecting the return of the beloved from the dead with an erotic dream from Euripides himself. Admetus, in Euripides' *Alcestis*, imagines lessening his grief for his wife, once she is dead, by means of a sculpted image of her, and also, he hopes, by visitations from her in his dreams:

> σοφῇ δὲ χειρὶ τεκτόνων δέμας τὸ σὸν
> εἰκασθὲν ἐν λέκτροισιν ἐκταθήσεται,
> ᾧ προσπεσοῦμαι καὶ περιπτύσσων χέρας
> ὄνομα καλῶν σὸν τὴν φίλην ἐν ἀγκάλαις
> δόξω γυναῖκα καίπερ οὐκ ἔχων ἔχειν·
> ψυχρὰν μέν, οἶμαι, τέρψιν, ἀλλ' ὅμως βάρος
> ψυχῆς ἀπαντλοίην ἄν. ἐν δ' ὀνείρασι
> φοιτῶσά μ' εὐφραίνοις ἄν· ἡδὺ γὰρ φίλους
> κἀν νυκτὶ λεύσσειν, ὅντιν' ἂν παρῇι χρόνον.
>
> (Euripides *Alcestis* 348–56)

It has been speculated that in this passage of the *Alcestis* Euripides borrowed the idea of grief assuaged by a sculpted image from his own *Protesilaus* (cf. 149ff.n. for the image in that play), and that the idea of returning in a dream might also have been borrowed from the same source:

> The reminiscence of *Protesilaus* is made the more likely by the following appeal to Alcestis to return in dreams, which could well be a 'faded' version of the return of her husband's spirit by night to Laodamia.
>
> (A.M. Dale (1954) on *Alcestis* 348–54)

Ovid too has incorporated a 'faded' version of Protesilaus' return; but in our epistle, unlike Euripides' *Alcestis*, the original version is perceived beneath the 'faded' one.

Ovid's Laodamia, then, has slept through the period of her husband's remission from the underworld, and does not realize it. Tragically, her *somni*, we realize, were not in fact *mendaces*; the *lec-*

---

[23] Suggestions of their lovemaking are found at Propertius 1.19.9, Servius on *Aen.* 6.447. Note perhaps also Laevius *FLP* 15 *complexa somno corpora ope-/riuntur ac suavi quie/dicantur*, which however Courtney takes to refer to Laodamia's embrace with the live Protesilaus before his departure for Troy.

tum was not *caelebs*; her *gaudia*[24] were not *falsa*. Allusion to Propertius 1.19.7–10 heightens the dramatic irony, by revealing to what extent Laodamia has misinterpreted the truth. In Propertius, the arrangement of *falsus* and *gaudium* is such that it describes Protesilaus, albeit in ghostly form (*falsis . . . palmis*),[25] ascending to Thessaly to claim *gaudia* with his wife; in 106 Ovid's Laodamia applies *falsus* in its regular sense ('not genuine') to the *gaudia* themselves, thus arriving at the mistaken notion that the lovemaking was imaginary.

108 cur venit a labris muta querela tuis:
cur venit a verbis multa querel(l)a tuis, given by all mss. save P, is followed by Ehwald, Giomini, and Dörrie. 'Why does much complaining arise from your words?' gives poor sense. *cur venit ah! verbis multa querela tuis*, printed by Madvig and followed by Shuckburgh, is little better, even with *venit* taken as a synonym for *est* (for which cf. 102n. *venis*): Ovid appears to avoid using *a(h)!* where it might be mistaken for the preposition *a* (4n.). Palmer and Baehrens were led astray by a clear error in P. That ms. had *cur venit a verbis multa*[26] *querellatens*, before it was changed to the majority reading. Palmer made three interrelated conjectures:

I cur venit, a verbis muta, querela latens	(Palmer (1874))
II cur venit ah! verbis multa querela latens	(Palmer (1898))
III cur venit a vobis multa querela latens	(Palmer 'in epistulis', according to Dörrie)

A. Baehrens (1885) 417 suggested *cur venit a! verbis multa querela carens*.

Palmer defends his *latens* at line end on the grounds that it is an adjective, not a participle:

> It would be fatal to the reading if *latens* were participial. Ovid is very chary of ending a pentameter with a participle. . . . But *latens* is adjectival, and is used simply as = *obscura*.

For adjective at line-end, cf. 14.4n. *piae*. The same defence cannot be applied to Baehrens' *carens*; moreover *verbis . . . querela carens* seems

[24] The joys of sex. See e.g. Knox on 15.126.

[25] See *TLL* s.v. *falsus* 192.45ff. 'adde de part. corp.: i.q. non verus, de mortuis et in metamorphosi vel artis imitatione.'

[26] In fact, it appears from my photograph copy that P originally gave . . . *a verbis multo* . . . and that the *o* of *multo* has been changed to an *a*.

an awkward expression: contrast the far more logical *careant tua verba querelis* at *Rem.* 509. Housman (1899) 174 brushes aside Palmer's conjecture **II**:

> 'verbis latens' is to mean 'dark-worded'. Who but its author can prefer this conjecture to Dr. Jackson's 'a *labris* . . . tuis'?[27]

In addition, the argument against *a(h)!* followed immediately by an ablative may be applied to Palmer **II**, and to Baehrens' conjecture. Palmer's other two brainchildren likewise seem too ugly to be loved by anyone but him. *a labris* is almost certainly right, despite *labrum* = lip being found only once elsewhere in Ovid (*Met.* 8.802). With *venit a labris* cf. Seneca *Ep.* 10.3 '*non a summis labris ista venerunt, habent hae voces fundamentum*'.

cur venit a labris multa querela tuis is an improvement on the paradosis; but it is not, I think, what the poet wrote. *multa* is bland, and *multa querela* a clumsy substitute for *multae querelae*. Furthermore, Laodamia would not need to ask *cur venit* if the lament were intelligible; and there is nothing in 108 as Jackson gives it to suggest that the *querela* cannot be understood.

The correct reading can be salvaged from Palmer and Baehrens: keep the *muta* of Palmer **II**, and the sense of Baehrens' conjecture, and one arrives at:

> cur venit a labris muta querela tuis?

muta querela = an inarticulate complaint. Palmer cites *Met.* 2.665 and 14.100 for *querela/queror* used of 'a plaintive inarticulate cry'. For *mutus* = inarticulate, see *OLD* s.v. *mutus* 1b. The corruption *muta*)(*multa* is an easy one: note *Met.* 10.389 and 11.602, where *multa* occurs as a variant to *muta*; note also *Met.* 14.739, a *locus desperatus*, where *muta* was conjectured by Madvig for the *multa* of the mss. *muta querela* (*muta*, like 107 *pallens*, emphatic through hyperbaton) may contain a further hint that this is Protesilaus returned from the dead. The dead themselves are commonly *muti*: see *TLL* s.v. *mutus* 1734.68ff. And

---

[27] Housman loc. cit. notes that Jackson's conjecture is to be found in *Athenaeum* 1874, 'in an unsigned review, and ascribed by name to its author in the *Transactions of the Cambridge Philological Society*, vol. 1 p. 377n. (1881).' Dörrie attributes the conjecture *a labris* to T. Birt (1882) 854ff.; he is censured by Goold (1974) 476 for not having taken the trouble to find out from Housman that Jackson got there first.

people who claim to have seen ghosts regularly state that the apparition was attempting to speak, but could not be heard.

109–112:
Laodamia rises from bed to make propitiatory sacrifices to the spectres of the night (109 *simulacra . . . noctis adoro*), whom, one assumes, she holds responsible for the disturbing nocturnal vision of her husband. Cf. the opening lines of Wordsworth's *Laodamia*:

> 'With sacrifice before the rising morn
> Vows have I made by fruitless hope inspired;
> And from the infernal Gods, 'mid shades forlorn
> Of night, my slaughtered Lord have I required. . . .'

The word *simulacrum* embraces the meanings 'dream' (see Shuckburgh on 10.95) and 'ghost' (Palmer cites *Am.* 1.6.9 *at quondam noctem simulacraque vana timebam*). But, used by Laodamia, the word has another, secondary, meaning. *simulacrum* commonly denotes a statue or image (*OLD* s.v. *simulacrum* 3) and at *Her.* 6.91 *simulacra . . . cerea* denotes a wax image. Later in our epistle, Laodamia mentions the wax image that stands in for her absent husband (150 *cera*, 154 *cerae*). *simulacra* in our line is suggestive of that image; moreover, *simulacra . . . adoro* reminds the reader of the Bacchic rites in which Laodamia worshipped it (33–4n.).

The undertone may provide further confirmation that Protesilaus is to be regarded as already dead, and the *pallens imago* as his ghost returned from Hades (105–8n.). According to one strand of the myth, Protesilaus' second descent to the underworld was followed by Laodamia's devotion to the image.[28] Ovid's reader might perhaps be familiar with this version,[29] and with the following sequence of events:—Protesilaus' return from the dead; his second descent; Laodamia's attachment to the wax image—and recognize that sequence

---

[28] Hyginus *Fab.* 104. Other treatments which include the wax image mention Laodamia's devotion to it before Proteislaus' return (Pseudo-Apollodorus *Epit.* 3.30), or as he returns (Eustathius on Homer *Il.* 2.701; cf. one of the scenes on the Naples relief, on which see 23–4n.).

[29] Ovid's reader is familiar with Protesilaus' return from the dead (105–8n.), and with Laodamia's death on the pyre with the image (149ff.n.). These two events are combined in Hyginus *Fab.* 104, to which the action of Euripides' play may have been similar (149ff.n.). In the version where Laodamia turns her attention to the wax image before Protesilaus' resurrection (Pseudo-Apollodorus), her death is by the sword and not on the pyre.

in 105–9. The temporary return of Protesilaus, Laodamia's love-making with him, and her subsequent devotion to the image remain visible to the reader beneath Laodamia's bad dream (105–8) and her characteristic attempt to ward off ill-omen (109).

The Catullan intertext already established (85–6n., 104n.) highlights the futility of Laodamia's over-eager religious activity here (110 *nulla caret fumo Thessalis ara meo*). Catullus' Laodamia disastrously neglected propitiatory sacrifices; Ovid's Laodamia makes up for that neglect, but she is now too late to save her husband. As at 85–6 (n.), Laodamia alludes to Propertius in an attempt to suppress the worrying Catullan detail. Laodamia's epistle is intertextual to Propertius 4.3 throughout (see intro.). With our passage, compare lines 57ff. of Propertius' poem, where Arethusa makes nocturnal sacrifices to secure her husband's safe return:

> flore sacella tego, verbenis compita velo
> et crepat ad veteres herba Sabina focos.
> sive in finitimo gemuit stans noctua tigno,
> seu voluit tangi parca lucerna mero,
> illa dies hornis caedem denuntiat agnis,
> succinctique calent ad nova lucra popae
>
> (57–62)

That passage provides Laodamia with a respectable precedent for night-time ceremonies.

But the Propertian intertext in turn introduces a further worrying omen. In 111–2, Laodamia makes offerings of frankincense at the altars: 'I offer frankincense, and tears on top; sprinkled with these tears, the altar-flame blazes up just as a flame is accustomed to rise when wine is poured on it.' The tears that make the flame flare up (111 *relucet*), and the accompanying simile, demand explanation: after all, the usual effect of tears on a flame is to put it out (e.g. Propertius 4.4.45–6). The commentators have thought that the flame in the simile was an altar-flame. Shuckburgh and Showerman-Goold hold that Laodamia's tears stand in for the wine used to put out the altar-fire:

> Laodamia says that her tears falling on the fire of the altar had the same effect as the wine which was usually employed to extinguish the embers, and which had the effect of making them blaze up, and then go out.
>
> (Shuckburgh *ad loc.*)

The final flare when the fire at the altar is quenched.
(Showerman-Goold's footnote *ad loc.*)

Palmer thinks that the tears stand in for libations of wine; tears in place of wine is a common motif (11.127n. *in vulnera*), but there is nothing in Laodamia's simile to suggest that the flame there is an altar flame, nor that the flame is being extinguished or a libation being made. It is by allusion that Ovid reveals the *flamma* he has in mind: that of a lamp. 112 alludes to Propertius 4.3.60 *seu voluit tangi parca lucerna mero*, where a sputtering lamp that calls for wine to be poured on it is regarded as some sort of omen. The allusion informs the detail of 111–2: Laodamia's tears acted like the wine poured on a sputtering lamp (cf. Loers (1825)). By means of this allusion, the omen at Propertius 4.3.60 is transferred to our passage.

The omen in Propertius is open to two interpretations. It may indicate the return of Arethusa's husband (so Butler (1905), D.R. Shackleton Bailey (1956a) 253): cf. *Anth. Graec.* 6.333, attributed to Ovid's contemporary Marcus Argentarius, where a flickering flame is said to announce the arrival of the beloved, and the modern superstition that the blazing-up of fire signifies an unexpected arrival (Opie-Tatem (1984) 150). Alternatively, it may indicate some disaster (e.g. Palmer on *Her.* 19.153): cf. Propertius 4.8.43[30] and Aratus *Diosem.* 302. It is, I think, deliberately ambiguous. The context does not resolve the ambiguity. The omen with which that of the lamp is paired—the cry of the *noctua*—is equally difficult to pin down;[31] and the sacrifices which these omens demand (61–2) may be to ratify the good omen or to avoid the bad. Arethusa's *parca lucerna*, then, is ominous, but the nature of the omen is left open (cf. Camps (1965) *ad loc.*, Kenney on *Her.* 19.154). The sprinkling of wine which is required (60 *voluit tangi mero*) has been variously interpreted as a response to the omen whether good or bad (Butler (1905), Kenney loc. cit.), or else merely a practical procedure, intended to relight the lamp (Camps, Palmer on *Her.* 19.153). To Ovid, the wine is important only as a verbal allusion: when Laodamia compares her

[30] Note however Paley (1872) *ad loc.*, who thinks that the flickering lamp presages the (unwelcome) return of the beloved, Cynthia.

[31] This omen may signify a change in weather, either from calm to storm or vice versa. Or the *noctua* may be standing in for the famously unlucky *bubo*.

tears with *merum*, the reader knows that, like Propertius' Arethusa, she has witnessed a sputtering flame. The Propertian omen is thus 'imported' into our epistle, and with it the ambiguous interpretation.

The ambiguity of the omen is in our passage wonderfully apposite: both interpretations bode badly for Laodamia. It indicates either some unspecified disaster,[32] or the return of the beloved. Laodamia's beloved has just made his final return. It is essential that the omen is present here only as an allusive echo: if Laodamia, a student of the supernatural, were allowed to dwell on the flickering flame and its significance, she might discover the true nature of the *pallens imago*, thereby shattering the dramatic irony and necessitating quite a different epistle altogether.

For Ovid's use of the ambiguity of the sputtering lamp for dramatic irony, cf. 19.151–6: Hero's nurse interprets the lamp's 'sneeze' as a sign of Leander's imminent safe arrival, but the reader may interpret it more unfavourably (Kenney on 19.154; cf. Purser (in Palmer) on 19.151).

109 somno:
The singular *somno* appears to fit in with the theory tentatively put forward under 11.31n. *somni*, that the plural of *somnus* is used by Ovid to designate the boon of sleep. Laodamia's sleep, despite affording the pleasure of erotic dreams (105–6), is troubled by the visit of the *pallens imago* (107–8). Nevertheless, after *excutio(r)*, Ovid always uses the singular (10.13, *Fast.* 1.547, 4.555, *Met.* 9.695, *Ibis* 154; cf. the striking *Met.* 11.621 *excussit tandem sibi se* of Sleep's awakening), seemingly regardless of whether the sleep is pleasing or not.

111 lacrimamque . . . qua sparsa relucet:
The variant *lacrimasque* may have arisen through unfamiliarity with the idiom *lacrima* (singular) = 'tears' (plural), on which see Heinsius and Palmer. Cf. the Greek δάκρυ for δάκρυα. Variants for *qua sparsa relucet*, followed or adapted by some editors (e.g. D. Heinsius favours *lacrimasque . . . queis ara relucet*,[33] Palmer suggests *lacrimamque . . . qua sacra*

---

[32] The widespread modern superstition that a flame may indicate the presence of ghosts (e.g. if it burns blue, Opie-Tatem (1989) 53–4, 150), though it would be highly apposite in our passage, appears to have had no ancient counterpart.

[33] *quis ara relucet* is given by a correcting hand in P, although other editors, including Dörrie, have reported otherwise.

relucet in his *ap. crit.*, Giomini prints *lacrimamque . . . quae sparsa relucet* and suggests *lacrimamque . . . quae inpersa/aspersa*), arose at least in part because there appeared to be no subject for *relucet* and no noun in agreement with *sparsa*. As Heinsius notes, *qua* = *'lacrima'*, and the subject of *relucet*, agreeing with *sparsa*, is *'flamma'*. Translate '. . . tears . . . with which the flame is spattered and blazes up, as a flame is accustomed to rise when wine is poured on.' In 111, *flamma* is supplied from the simile that follows; cf. e.g. Propertius 2.24.35–6 *tu mea compones et dices 'Ossa, Properti,/haec tua sunt?'*, where *ossa* is supplied with *mea* from the direct speech that follows. For *sparsa* = 'spattered, sprinkled (with)', see *OLD* s.v. *spargo* 8, and Heinius *ad loc.*, who cites examples of *spargo* + acc. + abl. = 'bespatter/besprinkle x with y', including instances where y = 'tears'. For *flamma* as the subject of *reluceo* (or perhaps *relucesco*; the two share the same perfect), cf. e.g. *Met.* 7.77 *extinctaque flamma reluxit* (*v.l. revixit*) and Virgil *Georg.* 4.385 *ter flamma ad summum tecti subiecta reluxit.*

113–120:

Laodamia speculates on her husband's safe return home. Speculation dissolves into fantasy as rhetorical questions (113–6) give way to statements of future 'fact' (117ff.).

The 'welcome home' scene is a *topos*, of which the motifs found here—embraces, kisses, the recounting of stories—are common elements. The *locus classicus* is the return of Odysseus in Homer *Od.*; cf. e.g. Catullus 9.6–9, Horace *Carm.* 1.36, and Statius *Silv.* 3.2.35–41. Note esp. *Am.* 2.11.43–54, where the poet, like Laodamia, indulges himself by imagining the happy return of the beloved. Embraces, kisses and stories are all present there; in addition, Ovid gives an ideosyncratic detail: such will be the lover's delight at reunion with his beloved that the welcome will take place in its entirety, including storytelling and a banquet, on the seashore.

In our passage, the familiar motifs are so ordered and expressed as to exhibit a strong sexual element. 113–4 describes the couple's embrace after Protesilaus' imagined return from Troy (113 *reducem*). From the conventions of the *topos*, one assumes that this embrace is imagined as taking place on the seashore (e.g. *Am.* 2.11 and Statius *Silv.* 3.2), but the passionate terms in which it is described make it more appropriate to the bedroom. For *solvo* of the physical effect of sex, see e.g. Virgil *Georg.* 4.198–9 *nec corpora segnes/in Venerem solvunt* (of bees); and cf. the common Greek epithet of love, 'limb-releasing'

(λυσιμελής). For *languor* and its cognates of post-coital fatigue, cf. *Her.* 15.50, *Ars* 2.692, *Fast.* 3.25, and Adams (1982) 196 on 'tiredness' in general.

The storytelling takes place in bed (115 *lecto . . . in uno*). Laodamia's desire that Protesilaus recount his deeds of military prowess (116) is not consistent with her attitude elsewhere (65–82, 89, 94–100), but in her fantasy he is returned, and his safety is no longer an issue (cf. the poet's attitude at *Am.* 2.11.50–4, where the safely-returned beloved is imagined as narrating—or inventing if necessary—her dangerous voyage home). Like Briseis at *Ars* 2.713–6, Laodamia would no doubt enjoy the frisson of a soldier's embrace.

Protesilaus is to intersperse his story with kisses (117ff.); indeed one strongly suspects that Laodamia is more interested in kisses than in the story itself, and that 117 *quamvis audire iuvabit* is a polite disclaimer. She attempts to persuade her husband that this is regular practice (119–20)—as indeed it is, particularly for amorous lovers. Cf. 3.128 *multaque mandatis oscula mixta feram* (of Briseis kissing Achilles), *Ars* 1.663 *quis sapiens blandis non misceat oscula verbis?*, *Met.* 10.559 *sic ait ac mediis interserit oscula verbis* (of Venus kissing Adonis); and, outside Ovid, e.g. *Anth. Graec.* 5.24.4 αὐτὴ καὶ προλέγει, καὶ προλέγουσα φιλεῖ; and note the kiss between friends at *Pont.* 4.9.13 *gratatusque darem cum dulcibus oscula verbis* (of the poet kissing Graecinus).

Laodamia shapes her imaginary scenario by means of a contrast with reality (or with what Laodamia thinks is real). 114 engages with 12. The reality of being separated from Protesilaus' embrace (12) becomes a desire to be overcome by amatory delight (114): the same verb (*solvor*) is used for both (cf. Jacobson (1974) 207); its meaning shifts from 'I am separated' to 'I melt away'; and the embrace which Laodamia was forced to cut short (12 *amplexu*) becomes the cause of her delight (113 *amplexa*). The emphatic . . . *ab ipsa mea* (114) alerts the reader to the fact that a contrast is being made; and *solvar ab*, where *solvar* + ablative would suffice, retains a parallelism with 12 *solvor ab*. The imagined embrace (113–4) recalls the actual embrace that had to be curtailed (12); the *multa . . . oscula* (118) recall the wish for *oscula plura* (7), and the *lingua*, which in reality had to cut short its goodbyes (13) is imagined as more happily employed. 115 engages with 105: 115 *lecto . . . in uno* picks up 105 *in lecto . . . caelibe*, and 115 *bene* ('properly', cf. 11.109–10) picks up 105 *mendaces . . . omnos*. Having experienced feigned lovemaking, Laodamia wants to experience the real thing. In fact, the reader suspects, she has already done so. The

dramatic irony of 105–8 (n.)—that Laodamia believes to be a dream what is in fact her resurrected husband—turns to pathos in our passage. Laodamia longs to talk and make love with her husband (115–6); in fact, her opportunity to do both has passed her by as *mendaces . . . somnos* (105) and *muta querella* (108). This is a keener pathos than that suggested by Jacobson (1974) 201:

> . . . the urgent rhetorical questions of 113–116 . . . cannot but make the reader respond to the pathos of *quando . . . quando*, 'numquam numquam'.

The reader's response is not 'never, never', but rather 'already, already'.

113–4 may be suggestive of a further missed opportunity: a branch of the mythographical tradition which Laodamia was unable to follow because she did not recognise Protesilaus' return from the dead for what it was. Servius on Virgil *Aen.* 6.447 states that Laodamia died in the embrace of her resurrected husband. Ovid's Laodamia cannot meet her end in such a way, since Protesilaus has already returned; rather, her death will involve the sculpted image of her husband (149ff.n.). 113–4 may be read both as 'When will I embrace you passionately?' and 'When will I die in your embrace?' (*solvo* of release from life, *OLD* q.v. 5d; cf. *Am.* 2.10.35–6, where Ovid describes his death in sexual terms, *at mihi contingat Veneris languescere motu,/cum moriar, medium solvar et inter opus*). The answer to this latter question is 'Never': Laodamia has missed her opportunity.

118:

The distinction commonly made between kisses given and kisses taken is an artificial one. The instigator of the kiss is variously described as giving or as taking it:

> The conditions . . . of a successful kiss are such that the distinction between giving and receiving is more logical than real, hence *dare* is regularly used of both in this connection . . . while the point of view may differ the result is much the same.
>
> (K.F. Smith (1913) on Tibullus 1.4.55)

Nevertheless, some degree of reciprocity is indicated in our line, while at the same time Protesilaus is made the subject of both verbs (*rapies . . . dabis*), and hence the focus of attention.

Heinsius prefers *capies*, which he finds in seven mss., to the majority reading *rapies*, and some editors follow him (Ehwald, Bornecque-Prévost, Showerman-Goold). With *capies oscula . . . dabis*, Heinsius

compares *oscula accipere . . . dare* at 15.129–30, and claims 'oscula non rapiuntur, nisi ab invitis', citing *Ars* 1.667–8 *tantum, ne noceant teneris male rapta labellis/neve queri possit dura fuisse, cave.* But *oscula accipere* gives insufficient support to *oscula capere,* of which the only example cited by *TLL* (s.v. *capio* 320.28ff.) is perhaps too late to be of much help here (Petronius 138.7); and Laodamia's fond imaginings of kisses snatched (*rapere*) by her husband are not as problematic as Heinsius suggests. At *Ars* 1.667–8, it is *male rapta* rather than *rapta* that characterizes the kisses as unwelcome. The nature of the kiss is expressed more by surrounding context than by the chosen verb. Thus e.g. *oscula sumere,* used in our epistle of kisses explicitly characterised as reciprocated (139–40), is applied to unwanted kisses at *Ars* 1.664, *illa licet non det, non data sume tamen. oscula rapere* and its cognates need not describe unwanted attentions: note the passionate and mutual clinch at *Her.* 18.113–4 *oscula congerimus properata sine ordine raptim/et querimur parvas noctibus esse moras.* The two further Ovidian instances of *oscula rapere* appear in the phrase *oscula rapta dare: Her.* 15.44 *oscula cantanti tu mihi rapta dabas* and *Am.* 2.4.26 *oscula cantanti rapta dedisse velim.* In neither case does context suggest that the girl to whom the snatched kisses are given is unwilling; indeed for Sappho at 15.44, as for Laodamia in our line, the kisses are a fondly imagined episode. At any rate, complicit participation in amatory activities is a complicated issue: cf. 11.39n. *vitiati*; and see besides Horace *Carm.* 2.12.25ff.:

> . . . cum flagrantia detorquet ad oscula
> cervicem aut facili saevitia negat
> quae poscente magis gaudeat eripi,
> interdum rapere occupat?

Context at *Her.* 15.44 and *Am.* 2.4.26 allows *rapies* in our line: in those passages, 'snatched' (*rapta*) kisses are given while one party is singing; the situation is similar in our line: one party is talking. It appears to be immaterial who snatches the kiss from whom: the point is that, if the mouth of one party is otherwise occupied, the kisses have to be snatched by somebody.

I keep *rapies,* then; but I suggest for consideration *carpes*: see *OLD* s.v. *carpo* 2 'To pluck, seize (things considered as fruits and often transitory in nature) . . . c. (kisses)'; and *TLL* s.v. *carpo* 494.41ff. and s.v. *osculum* 1113.65ff. Note *Am.* 2.11.45–6 *et multa sine ordine carpam/oscula* of kisses in a 'welcome home' scene. It would, perhaps, be too fanciful to note that the amorous doves with which Laodamia is

compared at Catullus 68.125ff. are described as 'plucking kisses', *oscula . . . decerpere* (127).

119:

'Properly-told tales always meet with such interruptions': a general claim, hence the change from future to present tense (*resistunt*, preferable to Bentley's *resistent*; 120 *est*). *apte* qualifies *narrantia*. Laodamia makes the hyperbolic implication that a story uninterrupted by kisses is always a story badly told. Isbell (1990) weakens the point by translating *semper* as *saepe*. For stories that would have met with Laodamia's approval, see 113–20n. *apte* perhaps contains a pun. *aptus* in another sense may be used of kisses themselves: see *Her.* 15.130 and perhaps also (depending on the text) Tibullus 1.4.54, with Smith (1913) on the latter: 'These are the "close" kisses of the Elizabethan poets, cp. Paulus, Ex Fest. 18 *aptus is qui convenientur alicui iunctus est.*'

verba:

Bentley's *labra* has some appeal, since *narrantia labra* are more directly and physically impeded by kisses than are *narrantia verba*; and see 108n. for the corruption *labrum*)(*verbum*. Nevertheless, with *narrantia verba* cf. 11.71 *precantia verba*; and for speech as the subject of *resistere*, *OLD* s.v. *resisto* 1d cites Quintilian *Inst.* 10.7.14 *verborum cavillatio* and 11.2.46 *oratio*.

120 refecta:

refecta was restored to the text by Francius. Some modern editors (Merkel, Ehwald, Showerman-Goold; so too Giomini, who nevertheless concedes the merits of *refecta*) prefer to retain the majority reading *referre*, which leaves *dulci . . . mora* hanging, and is superfluous since *promptus* requires no qualification: for *prompta lingua* = 'a fluent/ready tongue', Shuckburgh and Palmer cite *Fast.* 4.310; cf. Livy 22.44.7. *retenta*, a minority reading adopted by the older editors, including Heinsius, is an improvement on *referre*, but does not suit context; it was perhaps a scribal conjecture made through analogy with accounts of dumbness caused by fear (see e.g. 11.84). With *dulci . . . refecta mora*, Bentley and others compare *Fast.* 4.610 *maesta parens, longa vixque refecta mora est* of Ceres; Palmer notes also *Her.* 7.177–8 *laniataque classis/postulat exiguas semirefecta moras.* The variants *referta* and *refere* are perhaps a record of intermediate stages in the corruption of *refecta* to *referre*.

121ff.:

Laodamia breaks off from her reverie to express her worries concerning the sea and sea-winds. This is a seemingly abrupt change of direction ('Hope alternates with realism or rather is constantly confronted and defeated by it . . . erotic delusions return (113ff.), only to have reality intrude once more, *sed cum Troia subit* (121)', Jacobson (1974) 207–8); but it is neverthless signposted with a series of echoes. Laodamia's fantasy of her husband's return is constructed out of the reality of his departure (113–20n.). As the echoes of the opening lines of the letter escalate here, so Laodamia's mind turns back towards the Aulis beset with storms with which the epistle began. *venti* (4, 10, 11) and *freta* (5) occupy her thoughts once more (121 *ventique fretumque*), and the Greeks' confinement at Aulis (3 *morari*) returns as a verbal echo at 120 (*mora*). Inevitably, then, Laodamia's thoughts return at 121 to the harsh elements, with the assertion 'Whenever I think of Troy, I think of the winds and the sea'. Preoccupation with inclement sailing conditions is natural for one separated by sea from the beloved; but the association between *Troia* and *ventique fretumque* which Laodamia makes has, rather surprisingly, not been discussed by the commentators. In fact, such an association is wholly legitimate. Troy's connection with *venti* goes back to Homer: note esp. the epithet 'windy' (ἠνεμόεις) applied to Troy at *Il.* 3.305, 8.499, 12.115, 13.724, 18.174, 23.64, 23.297, and to the fig tree on the Trojan plain at 22.145; the wind at Hissarlik was further confirmation to Schliemann that he had found Homer's Troy.[34] *fretum* follows on from *venti* as a natural pairing (cf. e.g. 18.53); and in connecting Troy with the sea, Laodamia may already have in mind its foundation by the sea god, to which she will allude in 127.

---

[34] See e.g. H. Schliemann (1875) 224–5:

> . . . My poor wife and I have therefore suffered very much, for the strong icy north wind blew with such violence through the chinks of our house walls which were made of planks, that we were not even able to light our lamps of an evening. . . .

The editor of '*Troy and its remains*', Philip Smith, provided a footnote on 'the strong icy north wind':

> This recals to mind Homer's frequent mention of the blasts of Boreas.

This piece of classical learning was incorporated by Schliemann, without acknowledgement, into a later account (Schliemann (1881) 26). Current views on Schliemann's character suggest that such minor plagiarism would have concerned him not at all: see e.g. D.A. Traill (1995) *passim*.

From *ventique fretumque*, the mental leap to Aulis (123ff.) is a short one. 130 *mora*, picking up 120 *mora* and 3 *morari*, brings Laodamia's progression of thought full circle. Her account of the Greek army's sojourn at Aulis is wholly subjective. The reader will have been familiar with arguments in favour of disbanding the Greek army at Aulis, most notably from Euripides' *Iphigeneia at Aulis*, esp. 378ff., but perhaps also from rhetorical exercises (e.g. Seneca *Suas.* 3); Ovid ensures that Laodamia's version is idiosyncratic. 'Didonian arguments' (Jacobson (1974) 210) are adduced, and summarized succinctly in 125–6, where the tension between *in patriam* and *a patria* carries the point. Note however that, while Dido addressed her complaints to Aeneas himself, Laodamia blames not her husband but the Greeks (129 *Danai*, 132 *Inachiae . . . rates*) with whom he has thrown in his lot, just as at 4ff. the blame was apportioned to the winds (see 5n. *vestris obsistere remis*): contrast the second person plurals of our passage (124 *paratis*, 126 *datis*, 128 *ruitis, redite*, 129 *ruitis, audite*, 132 *vertite*) with the second person singulars of *Aen.* 4.309–313. The familiar argument that Helen does not deserve reclaiming, used by e.g. Agamemnon at Euripides *I.A.* 382–90 and Cassandra at *Tr.* 368–9 (see 135ff.n. for allusion to that passage), is used by Laodamia (131; cf. 47–8, but contrast 73–73a), but given an elegiac gloss. *turpis* is commonly applied, especially in Ovid, to adultery and to things and persons associated with it (6.133, *Am.* 3.6.76, *Trist.* 2.211–2, 515; cf. Catullus 42.3 and 61.99). In our line, the adjective makes a rhetorical contrast with *tanto*. For Helen as *adultera*, Palmer compares Catullus 68.103ff., where the expedition to prevent Paris dallying with the *abducta . . . moecha* (103) is deemed the cause of Laodamia's misery; cf. *Anth. Graec.* 9.166.3 ἐκ γὰρ τῆς Ἑλένης μοιχευσαμένης φόνος ἀνδρῶν, where Helen's adultery (μοιχευσαμένης) is judged the cause of many deaths.

127–30:

The editors follow the majority of mss. in presenting these lines in the following order:

127 ipse suam non praebet iter Neptunus ad urbem.
128 quo ruitis? vestras quisque redite domos!
129 quo ruitis Danai? ventos audite vetantes!
130 non subiti casus, numinis ista mora est.

A handful of MSS. vary this order:

Ab and Bx: 127, 129, 128, 130
Bi: 129, 128, 127, 130
M: 127, 128, 130, 129.
H omits 128, giving 127, 129, 130.

The variants almost certainly stem from the homoeoarchon in 128–9, with one or other or both of those line falling out of the tradition at some point or points, and being incorrectly reinserted. Thus any order that alternates hexameter with pentameter may be what Ovid wrote. The order given by Bi presents the information in a logical sequence (129, 128: 'Why rush to a foreign land?'; 127, 130: 'The god of the sea himself opposes you'); but the chiastic arrangement presented by the paradosis pleases nevertheless (cf. e.g. 16.145–8 for such an arrangement).

127, 130:
Laodamia's explanation for the delay at Aulis is sensible but wrong. According to her, the cause is a god (130 *numinis ista mora est*; for *mora* + genitive of cause, see *TLL* s.v. *mora* 1469.14ff., and note esp. Seneca *Suas.* 3.3 *illam enim moram naturae, maris et ventorum*, of the delay at Aulis)—Neptune, who is protecting his own city (127). *suam . . . urbem* alludes to Neptune's role in building the city of Troy; cf. Virgil's designation of Troy as *Neptunia Troia*, *Aen.* 2.625, 3.3. Neptune's relationship with Troy, however, is ambivalent and changeable: at Homer *Il.* 8.446ff. he does not want his handiwork destroyed, is said to watch over the city at Euripides *I.T.* 1414–5, and claims that he loves Troy in the prologue to Euripides *Tr.*; but at *Il.* 21.441ff. his anger at the first example of Trojan perfidy, the refusal to pay the divine builders the agreed fee for their work, drives him to rebuke his fellow-builder Apollo for not participating in the destruction of the city. In identifying Neptune as the cause of the delay, Laodamia is misguided. She is oblivious to the real cause: —the anger of Diana. She approaches the truth at 130, but the *numen* actually responsible for the *mora* is not the *numen* she has in mind. Similarly, the favourable weather that Laodamia prays for (134) will indeed ensue, but not because Laodamia has prayed for it. It will take more than a formulaic annulment of an ill-omen to secure the Greeks' arrival at Troy. The sacrifice of Iphigeneia is unknown to Laodamia. Dramatic irony here alienates Laodamia from the reader's sympathies. Her obsession with avoiding ill-omens jars against the reader's knowledge of Iphigeneia's death (or, in Euripides, close brush with death).

Laodamia's error is redeployed in *Met.*, where a nameless group of wrongthinkers is contrasted with Calchas:

> permanet Aoniis Nereus violentus in undis
> bellaque non transfert; et sunt, qui parcere Troiae
> Neptunum credant, quia moenia fecerat urbi,
> at non Thestorides; nec enim nescitve tacetve
> sanguine virgineo placandam virginis iram
> esse deae.
>
> (*Met.* 12.24–9)

128 vestras quisque redite domos:
See A.A.R. Henderson (1979) on *Rem.* 74 *vindictae quisque favete suae*:

> *quisque* constructed with the second pers. plur. is a distinct rarity (no examples in K.-S. or H.-S.); it is not unusual with the first pers. plur. Ovid however has this particular combination at three other places, *Her.* 13.130 [i.e. our line] *vestras quisque redite domos, Tr.* 5.3.48 *(vos quoque, poetae,) haec eadem sumpto quisque rogate mero, Ex P.* 1.10.44 *suppliciter vestros quisque rogate deos.*

Reflexive possessive adjectives in such sentences may either be second person plural, referring grammatically to the subject of the verb, or third person singular, referring grammatically to *quisque.* Thus we have in our line *vestras domos* ('Return to your homes—each man'). Compare *Pont.* 1.10.44 ('Beseech your gods -each man'), and contrast *Rem.* 74 ('Welcome deliverance—each man his own'). The ms. variant in our line *vestram . . . domum* has poor logic (return (pl.) to your own home (sing.)—each man); the variant *vestrum . . . deos* at *Pont.* 1.10.44, reported by Burman, is worse still ('Beseech the gods—each man your own').

129 ventos audite vetantes!:
The reader too can hear them, in the alliterative patterns of 126–30 (cf. 11.13n.). There may be etymological play in *ventos . . . vetantes*; cf. perhaps Isiodorus' claim that *ventus* is linked with *vehemens* and *violentus* (R. Maltby (1991) 635).

133:
sed quid ago? revoco? revocaminis omen abesto was restored by Merkel from the confusion of the mss. Most editors since have followed, rightly. On dactylic couplets with mid-line pause, see 14.21n.

revocaminis omen had already been conjectured by Heinsius and

Bentley for the reading *omen revocantis* (*revocantis omen* in some mss.; *revocantis et omen* in P *post correctionem*).[35] For *revocamen*, Heinsius cites *Fast.* 1.561, *Met.* 2.596 (variant *revocamur*) and 3.567 (where however modern editors read *moderamina*); he also suggests *revocatibus omen*, having found *revocantibus omen* in one ms., but prefers *revocaminis*—a preference subsequently borne out by the discovery of *omen revocaminis* in one ms. Heinsius notes the abundance in Ovid of nouns in *-men*; cf. J. Perrot (1961) 110–1. The extent to which the mss. have corrupted *revocaminis omen* (besides *omen revocantis* or *revocantis omen* or sim., Dörrie notes the readings *dictis his omen, dictis procul omen, laevum procul omen, saevum procul omen*, and *si iam his omen*) is not surprising: '*revocamen* appears to have been an Ovidian coinage' (Perrot 111), and doubtless therefore unfamiliar to the scribes. Moreover, *revoco revocaminis* may have caused difficulties, the one or the other falling out and leaving a gap to be filled by scribal conjecture: this explanation is supported by the omission of *revoco* or an equivalent from one ms., and the omission of *revocaminis omen* or an equivalent from another.

As for the first half of the line, Merkel's simple but effective conjecture *sed quid ago? revoco?* meets the challenge set by Heinsius ('viderint acutiores, si se felicius ex hoc loco expediant'). It is given by no ms.; but Giomini (in his *ap crit.*) claims that the *si quid ego revoco* of P was originally *si quid* ***ago*** *revoco*. The remaining mss. offer various readings. Merkel's conjecture has not been universally accepted: some subsequent editors have had other preferences. Readings followed and conjectures made include:

I sed quid ego revoco haec?
Micyllus and Burman

II sed quid ego haec revoco?
Palmer in his commentary (in his text he follows Merkel).
ms. Pv

III sed quid ego hos revoco?
Heinsius

IV sed quid ego has revoco?
Bentley

V sed quid ego hos? laevum [revocaminis omen abesto.]
Heinsius ('posset et legi . . .')

VI sed quid ego has? laevum [revocaminis omen abesto]
Heinsius

[35] P gives *si quid ego revoco [ ]s omen abesto*, with *revocaminis et* placed interlinearly above the erasure.

VII sed quid ago revocans?
Shuckburgh
A handful of mss.
VIII haec quid ago revocans?
Giomini

It seems likely that most, if not all, of these versions have been adopted more because of their status as ms. readings, or as close adaptions of ms. readings, than for their good sense and style. Version **I** can be rejected for the almost certainly faulty egō.[36] Giomini objects to **II**, **III**, **IV**, **V** on the grounds that *ego* in Ovid is never used to end one dactyl and begin the next.[37] More tellingly, the *ego* of versions **I**, **III**, **IV**, **V**, **VI** is unnecessarily emphatic. The same objection applies to version **II**, which Palmer punctuates as *sed quid ego haec? revoco?*, making citations for the omission of *dico* or sim., but which would more naturally be taken as *sed quid ego haec revoco?* It also applies to an alternative mentioned, but rejected, by Giomini, *haec ego quid revoco?* For the use of the participle in versions **VII** and **VIII** neither Giomini nor Shuckburgh adduce parallels.

It is not, however, the demerits of the alternatives that make *sed quid ago? revoco?* particularly attractive. This conjecture explains how so many versions of the line arose. Without the aid of punctuation, the juxtaposition *ago revoco* may have seemed peculiar to the scribes: thus, in some parts of the tradition, *ago revoco* became, naturally enough, *ego revoco*; in others, the apparent difficulty was solved by making *revoco* the participle *revocans*.

135ff.

Unable to summon her husband back from Aulis, Laodamia's thoughts turn enviously to the women of Troy, who, being in close proximity to their husbands during the war, will not share her predicament.

---

[36] It is generally held that egō does not occur in classical dactylic verse, and that, where mss. in such verse give egō, their testimony should be discounted. See e.g. W.M. Lindsay (1894) 422 and Platnauer *LEV* 50–1. Emendation of all such ms. occurrences of egō in order to remove exceptions to a perceived 'rule' may seem bold; at any rate, as regards our line, this is not the sole objection to version **I**. Micyllus attempts to defend egō as vowel lengthening at caesura; but such lengthening is rare at a second foot caesura, and besides is in Ovid almost always limited to 'lengthening' of *i* in the third person singular of perfect indicatives forming their perfect tense in *ii* (Platnauer 59–60; cf. 29n. *rediit*).

[37] The only possible exception is *Her.* 15.207 *ecquid ego*, where however most editors follow the reading *ecquid ago*.

This passage alludes to Euripides *Tr.* 353–405, where, by veiled references to the future, Cassandra claims that the Greeks fare worse from the war than the Trojans. The Greek soldiers, she argues, die separated from their families; the Trojans, if they die, receive proper burial, and if they live spend time with their families. W.M. Calder (unpublished: cited by Jacobson (1974) 198) suggests that Euripides may have reworked this passage of the *Troades* in his *Protesilaus*, and that Ovid found it there. It is, however, clear from various markers that *Tr.* 353ff. is the chief intertext. Laodamia questions the merit in seeking to reclaim the adulteress, Helen (131); so too does Cassandra (*Tr.* 368–9 [τοὺς 'Αχαιούς] οἳ διὰ μίαν γυναῖκα καὶ μίαν Κύπριν,/θηρῶντες 'Ελένην, μυρίους ἀπώλεσαν). Laodamia stumbles unwittingly across the myth of Iphigenia (127 130n.); Cassandra hints at the same myth (*Tr.* 370–3 ὁ δε στρατηγὸς ὁ σοφὸς ἐχθίστων ὕπερ/τὰ φίλτατ' ωλεσ', ἡδονὰς τὰς οἴκοθεν/τέκνων αδελφῷ δοὺς γυναικὸς οὕνεκα,/καὶ ταῦθ' ἐκούσης κοὐ βίᾳ/λελησμένης). Note esp. the 'Alexandrian footnote' 135 *Troasin*, which gives the name of the intertext (*Troiades*).

The relationship between our passage and *Tr.* 353ff. is dynamic, and involves other intertexts. The starting point is envy of the women of Troy (135 *Troasin invideo*), which engages with envy of a different kind in the Laodamia myth: Laodamia's amatory envy, of a putative rival for her husband's affections. See Laevius *FLP* 18; whether this envy featured in Euripides *Protesilaus* is disputed (Jacobson (1974) 200). Ovid's Laodamia envies not a rival, but those women able to remain with their husbands during the war. This kind of envy may engage with Arethusa's envy of Hippolyte at Propertius 4.3.43–6 (on 4.3 as a persistent intertext, see intro.). Laodamia's envy of the Trojans makes Jacobson a little uncomfortable:

> One who remembers the sorrow and pathos of the relationship between Hector and Andromache, one who has read Euripides' *Troades*, one who has directly experienced war would not so glibly utter *Troasin invideo* or paint a scene between wife and battle-bound husband with such bright colours and cheerful strokes. The tragedy is, of course, Laodamia's, but her insensitivity to the misfortune of others sets her own fate in a broader perspective.
>
> (Jacobson (1974) 204)

While we might hestitate to call the Trojan women fortunate, Laodamia's subjective view is given some weight when viewed against the backdrop of Cassandra's speech. For, to take up Jacobson, Cassandra <u>has</u> directly experienced war, and has <u>witnessed</u> (not merely read about) the events of Euripides' *Troades*, and yet still she argues that

the Trojans are less unfortunate than the Greeks. Indeed, Laodamia seems more sympathetic towards the Trojans than does Cassandra: the fact that the Trojans were buried by their relatives, which Cassandra deems a boon, is conceded by Laodamia as a disadvantage (135n. *quae si*). Laodamia has precedent for her opinions—but that precedent is Cassandra. The intertext may point out the similarity between the two heroines: Laodamia shares to some extent Cassandra's famous trait of foreseeing disaster but being powerless to persuade others or to avert it.

The hands that in Cassandra's speech cannot wrap the Greek dead in shrouds (*Tr.* 377 χεροῖν), and those that provide funeral rites for the Trojans (390 χερσὶν), are in Ovid hands that dress the Trojan warrior in armour (137 *manibus*) before escorting him to battle (141, *OLD* s.v. *produco* 1c). The arming of a warrior by his wife or mother is a common motif, especially on vase-paintings (F. Lissarague (1992) 172ff.). It has been suggested that 137ff. relate in some way to Hector's farewell to Andromache in *Iliad* 6 (Jacobson (1974) 204, Isbell (1990) 117). The women, plural, of 135–6 have become a woman, singular, at 137, and the singular remains throughout the episode (to 146). But this woman is not Andromache. Homer's Andromache is no *nova nupta* (132), nor does she arm her husband in the manner described at 137–8 (at *Il.* 6.466ff., Hector puts on his own helmet). Ovid's Hector at *Am.* 1.9.35–6 has an Andromache to place the helmet on his head, but helmets are common enough in arming-scenes (e.g. Lissarague (1992) 174, plates 19 and 20; Plutarch *Moral.* 760F, where Cleomachus has his helmet put on his head by his beloved before battle). Laodamia's account of the fortunate Trojan woman and her husband is not based on any actual Trojan couple, but rather derives from her own concerns and desires for herself and Protesilaus. See Jacobson (1974) 204:

> This Trojan couple are not merely conceptual counterparts for Laodamia and Protesilaus; they virtually are Laodamia and Protesilaus.

Jacobson goes on to give specific details. *forti nova nupta marito* (137) introduces the couple: the woman is a *nova nupta* because Laodamia herself is a recent bride;[38] the man is *fortis* because Laodamia is

[38] For Laodamia and Protesilaus as recently married, cf. e.g. Catullus 68.81 *coniugis . . . novi* (of Protesilaus); Lucian *Dial. Mort.* 410.1 νεόγαμον γυναῖκα (of Laodamia); Schol. Aristides 3.671 2D καὶ μίαν ἡμέραν μόνην συγγενόμενος τῇ γυναικὶ (of Protesilaus).

attracted to brave men and, despite concerns for Protesilaus' safety, likes to think of him as brave (115–6, with 113–20n.). The activities of the couple match the activities that Laodamia imagined would take place on Protesilaus' return (113ff.), with some verbal correspondences. Thus, the couple kiss (139), and the kisses are reciprocal (140), just as were the imagined kisses of 118 (see n.). There may be a verbal echo of 118 at 139: *arma dabit* (138–9) leads to *oscula sumet* (139) through reminiscence of . . . *rapies oscula* . . . *dabis* (118). The couple embrace (145–6; on the cosy tone of *lassa*, see 14.131–2n.), and the language reflects that of the imagined lovemaking of 113–4: 145 *reduci*, 113 *reducem*; 146 *lassa* 114 *languida*; 145 *galeam resolvet*, 114 *solvar*. What is denied to Laodamia is permitted for the imaginary woman: like the imagined return (113–20n.), the imaginary couple are a reaction to the departure scene. Laodamia's parting instructions (*mandata*) were cut short (7–8), while the Trojan woman can give her *mandata* at leisure (141), and can tell her husband in person (142) what Laodamia could voice only as a prayer to the gods (50); note that the woman uses Laodamia's diction in phrasing her command: *fac* + second person subjunctive rather than simple imperative (cf. 69, 90). Laodamia's concern that Protesilaus heed her advice to take care is a recurring feature of her epistle; the imaginary Trojan need have no such concern, as her husband will do as he is told (143–4). He, unlike Protesilaus, will have his wife's commands to fight with caution fresh in his mind (143 *recentia*) during each battle.

Such correspondences make it clear that the Trojan woman is created by Laodamia as an object of envy out of her wishes and frustrations. This is what modern psychologists term 'projection'. Ovid doubtless had no name for this universal phenomenon, but he exploits it to good effect, especially in the *Heroides*. The most celebrated example is at 3.11–2, where Briseis 'projects' her own feelings onto the messengers Eurybates and Talthybius (Jacobson (1974) 25–6). Cf. also e.g. 14.85–108n.

135 Troasin invideo:

Troasin (Greek dative plural) was restored by Salmasius (lived 1588–1653). The emendation was accepted by Heinsius, and subsequently by the majority of modern editors. The mss. fail to transmit the correct Greek form: the majority give *Tro(i)adas; Troades* and *Troadis* are given by one ms. each. P gives *Troas*, perhaps a less advanced stage of the corruption: the error may be explained (cf. Dörrie) as hap-

lography; at any rate, it was, according to Heinsius, by repeating the initial syllable of *invideo* that Salmasius made his conjecture. Greek Dative plurals in Latin seem particularly prone to mangling: cf. *Ars* 3.672 *Lemniasin*, restored by Heinsius in his note on our line (the mss. give *Lemnias et/lenios et/Lemniadum/Lemniades/Lemniadis*); *Trist.* 5.5.43 *heroisin*, restored by Scaliger and Salmasius (the mss. give *eroibus/hororibus/herodibus/eroidibus*); Propertius 1.20.12 *Adryasin*, conjectured by Struve, or *Hydriasin*, Lachmann (the mss. give *adriacis*).

Some older editors wished to keep *Troadas* (Greek accusative plural), as later did Giomini. For accusative plurals in -dăs, see e.g. Housman (1910) 261ff. However, the dative, not the accusative, is required with *invideo*. *invideo* + accusative = 'I envy someone' is Latin, and *invideo* + accusative + dative = 'I envy someone (for) something' is reasonably common; but neither are found in Ovid. Giomini regards *Troadas invideo* as a permissible archaism. He quotes a line from Accius' *Melannipus*, *unde aut quis mortalis florem liberum invidit meum?* (preserved both by Cicero *Tusc.* 3.20 and by Nonius 500.14), with selections from Cicero's discussion on that line:

> quod verbum [sc. invidia] ductum est a nimis intuendo fortunam alterius, ut est in Melanippo . . . ut enim videre, sic invidere florem rectius quam flori . . . poeta ius suum tenuit et dixit audacius.

But the anachronism in our line would be isolated and without point. What Giomini leaves out of his quotation of Cicero *Tusc.* 3.20 is telling:

> male Latine videtur, sed praeclare Accius: ut enim videre sic invidere florem rectius quam flori; nos consuetudine prohibemur; poeta ius suum tenuit et dixit audacius.

If Ovid were quoting from an early source, that might explain an archaism, but it is more likely that the mss. are at fault. Micyllus defended *Troadas invideo* as *invideo* + accusative and infinitive (cf. e.g. *Met.* 4.156–7), with the infinitive in ellipse—a strange and unconvincing analysis.

quae si:

si = 'even if . . .', *OLD* s.v. *si* 9. The mss. have *sic*. *quae si* was claimed by Heinsius as the reading of P. When it was discovered that P in fact clearly reads *qui sic*, editors reverted to a preference for *sic*—such is the exaggerated esteem in which P is held (see intro.). Ehwald

was the first to print *quae si* while knowing it to be a conjecture and not a ms. reading. Palmer's wrongheaded defence of *sic* was attacked by Housman:

> *Troasin invideo, quae sic lacrimosa suorum/funera conspicient, nec procul hostis erit.* '*sic*: οὕτως, αὔτως just as they are, without any difficulty' [Palmer]. Laodamia envies the women of Troy who, without any difficulty, will see their countrymen killed! Then in the critical note: '*quae si* falso citatum est ex P ab Heinsio, et ita male ediderunt Burman et Ehwald. *quamvis* Bentley, Lehrs, quod sententiam pessumdat.' So much the better, considering what a 'sententia' it is. *si* is right: *Troasin invideo, quae si . . . suorum funera conspicient . . ., ipsa suis manibus forti nova nupta marito imponet galeam* etc.: the women of Troy, even though they see their countrymen killed, will have their husbands' company.
>
> (Housman (1899) 176)

quae sic is not as ludicrous as all that: 'They will see the *lacrimosa suorum funera*' need not in itself be a concession: *lacrimosa funera* are more likely to be funerals than deaths (cf. the other Ovidian occurrence of *lacrimosa funera, Met.* 14.746 *funera ducebat mediam lacrimosa per urbem*, where however *lacrimosa* is sometimes taken as feminine singular rather than accusative plural—so e.g. Bömer (1969–1986)), and attending personally to the funeral rites of one's relatives may be something to be envied (thus did Cassandra consider the Trojans fortunate in their funerals at Euripides *Tr.* 386ff.—cf. 135ff.n.). However, *sic* is unhelpful at best, and, whereas the Trojan women might be either envied or pitied for witnessing the *lacrimosa suorum funera*, the proximity of the enemy (*nec procul hostis erit*) can be regarded only as a bad thing.

135–6 *lacrimosa . . . erit* must therefore be concessive. There is little to distinguish, as far as syntax and sense are concerned, between *quae si* and the *quamvis* suggested by Bentley and followed by C. Lehrs (1863) 60, although *quae si* is perhaps slightly better: *si*)(*sic* is an easy corruption, especially since the reader has to wait until the following couplet for the apodosis of the conditional clause. Punctuate as follows:

Troasin invideo: quae si lacrimosa suorum
        funera conspicient nec procul hostis erit,
ipsa suis manibus forti nova nupta marito
        imponet galeam Dardanaque arma dabit.

(Of those editions that print *quae si*, most, including Dörrie, punctuate in a confusing manner, with a strong pause after *nec procul hostis*

erit.) If *quae si* is taken as = '. . . who, if. . .', the reader will stumble against 137 *ipsa*, where the plural *quae* must now be redeployed as a singular subject of *imponet* and *dabit*; but *quae* will perhaps be readily taken as a connective relative (*OLD* s.v. *qui* 14), and *quae si* as 'For if they', allowing a change of subject in the new clause at 137–8. Laodamia's switch from discussing Trojan women to discussing a Trojan woman is notable: the target of her envy, a projection of her own desires (135ff.n.), becomes more focused.

quae si is almost certainly right; but worth recording is A.S. Hollis' suggestion *quod si* (unpublished), 'I envy the Trojan women the fact that, even if. . . .'

139–40:

Palmer brackets this couplet, commenting only (in his *ap. crit.*) 'ineptum distichon seclusi'. Housman (1899) 177 assumes that Palmer's objection is to the epanalepsis (10–11n.) and repetition of *arma dabit*. On repetition as the device of poet or interpolator, see 73, 73a, 73b, 74n. The repetition in our couplet may be defended as 'poetic', if one regards it as reflective of Laodamia's thought processes: she fumbles for an association between giving the warrior his helmet and giving him kisses. No edition since has followed Palmer's judgement here. Cf. Housman loc. cit., '. . . lines which no one ever suspected before or will ever suspect again he attacks in a fashion modelled on Aesop's fable of the wolf and the lamb.'

140:

'This type of task [in contrast with the task of arming described in the previous lines] will be pleasing to both.' The verse may contain a pun. *hoc genus officii* = 'kisses'; for *officium* = an amatory service, see *OLD* s.v. *officium* 1c, Adams (1982) 163–4.

145:

Certain mss. ('*multi codices*' according to Burman; three according to Dörrie) transpose *clipeum* and *galeam*. Burman gives citations to show that one more rightly undoes (*resolvere*) a helmet than a shield.

146 corpora:

Burman prints *pectora*. There is little to choose between *corpora* and *pectora* (for the crux, cf. Virgil *Aen.* 10.486), save that *excipiet . . . pectora . . . sinu* suggests a rather unlikely posture; and that *pectora* is found

in only a handful of mss. The corruption either way is not difficult: words scanning as a dactyl are readily confused (O. Skutsch (1985) 401, with bibliography).

147–8:

Unlike the imagined Trojan woman, Laodamia does not know how her husband is faring. The motif 'Fear for the beloved's safety makes one suspect the worse' is here succinctly phrased: note in particular the juxtaposition *fieri facta* on which the pentameter turns. For the sentiment, cf. 1.11–2 and 71–2. Cf. too 10.79–80 ('Fear makes one expect the worse for oneself') and the corresponding idea at *Am.* 2.13.6 *est mihi pro facto saepe quod esse potest* ('Self-deception makes one expect the best for oneself'; but see McKeown (1998) for an alternative interpretation). *Pont.* 2.7.5–6 *nec dubito quin sit: sed me timor ipse malorum/saepe supervacuos cogit habere metus* may draw directly on our lines: compare verse 4 there, *et si, quicquid agis, sit tibi cura mei*, with the final line of our poem. In our lines the motif has added poignancy: the worst that Laodamia fears will indeed ensue; cf. Jacobson (1974) 400. The *sententia* pleased the compilers of the *florilegia*, several of whom include our line and 1.11–2; they replace the *nos* of our hexameter with the unmetrical *saepe*, thus making the observation more universal. *nos* contains something of both a 'real' plural ('We Greek women', in contrast with 135 *Troasin*) and a plural for singular ('I', in contrast with 137 *ipsa*).

It is possible that our lines have been constructed out of Laodamia's jealousy of a rival, a theme present in the pre-Ovidian myth (135ff.n.). It is clear from context that the *omnia . . . quae possunt fieri* which Laodamia fears are possible threats to Protesilaus' safety; but in another context a similar sentiment might suggest fear of possible threats to the beloved's fidelity. When Penelope has voiced the motif 'Fear makes one suspect everything' at 1.71–2, she goes on to suggest what 'everything' (*omnia*) might include; one suggestion is that Ulysses may take another lover (a fear that the reader knows is justified). Note *Ars* 3.718–20, of Procris' fear that she has a rival for Cephalus' affections: *incertus pectora versat amor./credere quae iubeant, locus est et nomen et index/et quia mens semper, quod timet, esse putat.* Cf. *Met.* 7.719 *cuncta timemus amantes* (Cephalus and Procris again; context shows that *cuncta* includes marital infidelities) and Propertius 1.11.18 . . . *in hac omnis parte timetur amor* (fear of infidelities). Our couplet may allude specifically to lines in a lost treatment of the myth that mentioned Laodamia's

suspicions that her husband was being unfaithful. The delayed *timor* in our pentameter might have been *amor* in that model. For *anxius amor*, cf. e.g. Cicero *Att.* 2.24.1 *novi enim te et non ignoro quam sit amor omnis sollicitus atque anxius*:—interestingly enough, it has been suggested that *quam sit* etc. is a quotation from a (lost) play; see e.g. R.Y. Tyrrell – L.C. Purser (1904–1933) *ad loc.* 'This is probably a verse from some drama: Mr. Jeans very happily renders "I cannot forget that to love *is to be all made of sighs and tears*" [= Shakespeare *As you like it* 2491]', but contrast Bailey (1965–70) 'An iambic senarius, as pointed out by Tyrrell, probably fortuitous.'

149ff.:

During Protesilaus' absence, Laodamia has a wax image (150, 154 *cera*, 153 *imago*) to which she can turn her affections.

The image of Protesilaus is found elsewhere in the myth (cf. 105–8n.). Whether it featured in Euripides' *Protesilaus* is open to question. The argument turns in part on a fragment from that play, fr. 655 Nauck οὐκ ἂν προδοίην καίπερ ἄψυχον φίλον. The source for the fragment attributes the remark to Laodamia (pseudo-Dio Chrysostom 37.46 κατὰ τὴν Εὐριπίδου Λαοδάμειαν).[39] The ἄψυχον φίλον which Laodamia is unwilling to betray may simply be her husband's memory, or perhaps even his corpse (cf. the apparent necrophilia in Eustathius' version). More likely, however, it is the image of Protesilaus: pseudo-Dio Chrysostom makes the quotation in connection with an image of himself. Admetus in Euripides *Alcestis* imagined assuaging his grief by means of an image, and it has been suggested that Euripides was drawing on his own *Protesilaus* (105–8n.).

Laodamia presents her devotion to the statue as something wholly natural. It arises naturally out of her 'psychological profile': like her fantasy of Protesilaus' return (113ff.) and her envy for the imaginary Trojan couple (135ff.), the image that stands in for Protesilaus has its roots in the curtailed departure scene (7ff.). Verbal echoes and reminiscences make this apparent: *tibi debita verba* (151) recalls the *verba imperfecta* (13) of the departure scene, as did the storytelling of the return fantasy (116) and the *mandata* of the Trojan wife to her husband; the embraces cut short at 12, imagined at 113 and envied at 146 are here (152) bestowed on the image; and the husband

[39] The mss.' καὶ τὴν was emended to κατὰ τὴν by Henri de Valois (lived 1603–1676).

carried away from her gaze (17 *spectare*), the cause of her envy for anyone who can remain in view of their beloved (144 *respiciet*... *domum*), is here replaced by the image (155 *hanc specto*). There are also verbal links to the erotic dream (107ff.): 107, 153 *imago*, 108 *querela*, 156 *queror*. The ghostly vision (*imago*) uttered murmurings, but Laodamia did not understand (108); Laodamia now murmurs to the image (*imago*) as if it understands (156). There seems to have been in antiquity a close association between a vision of the beloved in a dream and a representation of the beloved in the form of an image: E.K. Borthwick (1969) 174 cites passages where the two motifs are combined, including our epistle; cf. Admetus in Euripides *Alcestis*, who imagines that both an image and erotic dreams will assuage his grief (105–8n.). Strong sexual overtones seem traditionally to have been present in Laodamia's relationship with the image; 'It is a commonplace of love poetry (and I dare say of life) that such likenesses, from the ancient portrait to the modern photograph, may be kissed *in absentia*' (Borthwick loc. cit.), but Laodamia goes considerably further (pseudo-Apollodorus *Epit.* 3.30 καὶ ποιήσασα εἴδωλον Πρωτεσιλάω/παραπλήσιον τούτῳ προσωμίλει; Eustathius on Homer *Il.* 2.701 ἀγάλματι αὐτοῦ περικειμένην; Hyginus *Fab.* 104 *viditque eam ab amplexu Protesilai simulacrum tenentem atque osculantem*; Tzetzes *Chil.* 2.52.772 συνεκοίταζων αὐτῇ τῷ πόθῳ τοῦ συζύγου; cf. perhaps Euripides fr. 655 Nauck, where Laodamia refuses to betray (προδοίην) the ἄψυχον φίλον). Cf. Jacobson (1974) 211. Ovid's Laodamia rationalizes this sexual element, and makes so extreme a passion seem credible and reasonable. 149–57 present a gradually increasing catalogue of infatuation. The sexual element creeps in almost unnoticed. Laodamia begins by describing the embraces and blandishments offered to the image: cf. Admetus' intentions at Euripides *Alcestis* 350–1 ᾧ/[sc. the image] προσπεσοῦμαι καὶ περιπτύσσων χέρας/ὄνομα καλῶν σὸν. At the mention of embraces (152 *amplexus*), Laodamia breaks off with the assertion that the image is more than it seems (153–4). The catalogue of activities then resumes with increased sexual overtones. 155 *pro coniuge vero* goes beyond Admetus' τὴν φίλην ἐν ἀγκάλαις δόξω γυναῖκα καίπερ οὐκ ἔχων ἔχειν (*Alcestis* 351–2) and elicits sexual meanings for the surrounding words and phrases: *hanc specto* (cf. *Am.* 3.2.5, 3.2.16, 3.2.28, *Ars* 1.99, 1.573, 2.503, 3.513, 3.675, 3.774, *Her.* 17.77, 21.105); *teneo* . . . *sinu*; *queror* (*Ars* 2.723 4 *accedent questus, accedet amabile murmur/et dulces gemitus aptaque verba ioco*). A change in context also rationalizes the sexual element. Elsewhere in the myth, Laodamia

usually devotes herself to the image as a remedy for grief, after she has learnt of her husband's death (e.g. Hyginus *Fab.* 104, Tzetzes *Chil.* 2.52.768–74). In our epistle, the image is a comfort not for grief but for loneliness—a less extreme passion (cf. e.g. Silius Italicus 8.91ff., where Dido attempts to comfort herself after Aeneas' departure with images of him and his son). One detail in particular secures this change from tragic to elegiac: the material from which the image is made. Prior to Ovid, it was either metal (Hyginus *Fab.* 104 *simulacrum aureum*, wrongly 'emended' to *simulacrum cereum* in order to concur with our passage; cf. Statius *Silv.* 2.7.129 *vultus . . . simili notatus auro*, in a passage which may draw on Euripides *Protesilaus* (33–4n.)) or wood (Tzetzes *Chil.* 2.52). In Ovid, the image is made of wax (150 *cera*, 154 *cerae*; *OLD* s.v. *cera* 5 'A wax bust or figure'). Wax is the material of the images of the beloved at *Rem.* 723–4 and *Anth. Graec.* 12.183;[40] cf. also the two-dimensional encaustic paintings at *Anacreontea* 15 and 16 (Bergk), cited by Heinsius. A lover may keep a gold image of the beloved, like that which Cynthia's ghost accuses Propertius of having melted down at Prop. 4.7.47–8; but a wax image is a more sympathetic reminder. Metal images are cold: see e.g. *Anth. Graec.* 5.166 ψυχρᾷ/ . . . εἰκασίᾳ;[41] cf. Euripides *Alcestis* 353, where Admetus terms the embracing of his wife's image a 'cold pleasure' (ψυχρὰν . . . τέρψιν), perhaps with a metal statue in mind. Wax is an elegiac material (F. Spoth (1992) 104), and more sensuous than metal: the image of Love at *Anacreontea* 10 (Bergk), which the poet buys at a cut-down price with the intention of taking it to bed with him, is made of wax; and the statue made by Pygmalion, though of ivory (*Met.* 10.248 *ebur*) is compared with wax as it transforms under Pygmalion's touch (283–6). That the image is made of wax makes Laodamia's devotion to it seem, on the face of it, more understandable.

Laodamia's erotic attachment to an image, like the attachment proposed by Admetus at *Alcestis* 348ff., has met with predictable unease from some scholars. The *Alcestis* passage was termed a 'frigidum poetae inventum' (Hermann (1824)) and an 'inventum valde absurdum' (Dindorf (1832–40)), before being defended with the attribution to the ancients of 'a much deeper feeling for sculptured forms

[40] Attributed to Strato. On his date, probably Hadrianic, see A. Cameron (1993) 65ff.

[41] Attributed to Meleager, early first century B.C. See Cameron 49ff. εἰκασίᾳ is a conjecture for the corrupt ἐνοικισίαι.

than we can pretend to realise' (Paley (1857)). Palmer (1874) thought our passsage 'unspeakably silly'; having been reprimanded by Shuckburgh ('... has he not done something to create the silliness which he derides by translating cera "a doll"?'), and having himself found parallels for Laodamia's erotic attachment to the image, Palmer (1898) silently recanted. The point is, of course, that even the ancients with their 'deep feeling for sculptured forms' would not have considered the behaviour of Admetus or Laodamia wholly reasonable. The reader of our epistle can catch glimpses of Laodamia's morbidity. Note the emphatic protestation that there is more to the image than meets the eye at 153, perhaps a hint at sympathetic magic (on which see e.g. Pease (1935) on Virgil *Aen.* 4.508 *effigiem*). Note too how use of pronouns reveals Laodamia's 'perversity'. At 150–1, anaphora of *ille* emphasizes that the image is standing in for the absent Protesilaus, 'to it (and not to you). ...' In 150, the datives *illi* ... *illi* give the illusion of a respectably masculine object for Laodamia's affections. *illa* (152) and *hanc* (155) break the illusion: the pronouns are feminine; they take their gender from *cera* (150, 154) and *imago* (153), but 'she accepts my embraces' and 'at her I gaze' written by a woman might suggest 'an unheard of, monstrous love' (*Met.* 9.727–8 *cognita* ... *nulli* ... *prodigiosa novaeque/cura tenet Veneris?*, Iphis' description of her own love for Ianthe).[42] Laodamia asserts that, apart from the fact it cannot speak, the image is just like the real Protesilaus,[43] an exaggerated claim: contrast Admetus' more reasonable assertion that the statue will be a 'cold pleasure' (Euripides *Alcestis* 353), 'ψυχρὰν μέν, οἶμαι, τέρψιν shows a disarming awareness of the touch of extravagance in his idea' (Dale (1954) there).

The form that the motif takes in Ovid—a wax image is an expression of loneliness and extreme love for a beloved believed absent but alive—seems, perhaps surprisingly, to draw on a universal aspect of human nature. H.J. Rose (1927) 58 notes the death, recorded in the *Daily Mail* for March 7, 1927, of a resident of a mental asylum:

[42] Unease with the feminine object of Laodamia's attentions may have contributed to Francius' conjecture 155 *hunc specto*, reported by Burman. Heinsius himself suggests *huic* for *et* in 156.

[43] For *sonus* = the faculty of speech, see *OLD* s.v. 2b. Heinsius compares with 153–4 the instructions to the encaustic artist at *Anacreontea* 15 and 16: 15.33–4 ἀπέχει· βλέπω γὰρ αὐτήν· τάχα, κηρέ καὶ λαλήσεις and 16.25–6 τὸ δὲ πᾶν ὁ κηρὸς αὐτὸς ἐχέτω λαλῶν σιωπῇ.

> His name was Michael Kalosy, and he was a Hungarian of good family. Being refused marriage by the parents of a remarkably beautiful Jewess, he had a lifelike wax figure of her made, and for some time kept it in his flat and talked to it, until he was induced to take it with him into a mental asylum.

The mention of the image makes two important contributions to dramatic irony in the epistle. First, it is a temporal marker, signifying to the reader that Protesilaus is, despite Laodamia's belief to the contrary, already dead. The image is, in the pre-Ovidian myth, usually a consolation for Laodamia's grief. In no version does Laodamia make the image while Protesilaus is still alive. Ovid's reader plays Laodamia's version off against the pre-Ovidian myth: when Laodamia makes the image, the reader expects Protesilaus to be dead. Moreover, at least one version of the myth has Laodamia make the image when she thinks her husband alive, but he has in fact already been killed:

> τῶν δὲ Ἑλλήνων πρῶτος ἀπέβη τῆς νεὼς Πρωτεσίλαος, καὶ κτείνας οὐκ ὀλίγους τῶν βαρβάρων ὑφ' Ἕκτορος θνήσκει. τούτου ⟨ἡ⟩ γυνὴ Λαοδάμεια καὶ μετὰ θάνατον ἤρα, καὶ ποιήσασα εἴδωλον Πρωτεσιλάῳ παραπλήσιον τούτῳ προσωμίλει. Ἑρμῆς δὲ ἐλεησάντων θεῶν ἀνήγαγε Πρωτεσίλαον ἐξ Ἅιδου. Λαοδάμεια δὲ ἰδοῦσα καὶ νομίσασα αὐτὸν ἐκ Τροίας παρεῖναι τότε μὲν ἐχάρη, πάλιν δὲ ἐπαναχθέντος εἰς Ἅιδον ἑαυτὴν ἐφόνευσεν.
> (pseudo-Apollodorus *Epit.* 3.30)

According to pseudo-Apollodorus, Laodamia falsely believes that Protesilaus' return is from Troy, and not, as proves to be the case, from Hades; she must therefore have been ignorant of his death up until that moment. Thus, at the time when she makes the image, although Protesilaus has in fact already been killed (ὑφ' Ἕκτορος θνήσκει), Laodamia believes that he is still alive. A.M. Harmon (1912) 189 argues, on the basis of Laevius *FLP* 18, that in the *Protesilaodamia* too Laodamia at first thought Protesilaus' return was from Troy; see Courtney for an alternative interpretation of that fragment. Similarly, Ovid's Laodamia believes her husband alive after he has died; the epistolary form exploits the dramatic irony. Cf. Borthwick 174, '. . . Ovid's letter of Laodameia to Protesilaus—written in ignorance of his death. . . .' See further my intro.

The image also plays with the reader's expectations of Laodamia's own death. Her suicide is a staple part of the myth; the form of suicide varies. In some versions she simply 'pines away'; at pseudo-Apollodorus *Epit.* 3.30, she stabs herself when Protesilaus returns to the underworld; she also uses a sword in one of the versions given

by Eustathius on Homer *Il.* 2.701. Laodamia's suicide appears to have featured in Euripides *Protesilaus*: see fr. 656 Nauck]σα λαιμὸν ἢ πεσοῦσ' ἀπ' ἰσθμίου/κευθμῶνα πηγαῖον ὕδωρ, with Nauck's comment, 'agitur enim . . . de Laudamia dubitante quod mortis genus oppetat, utrum gladio pereat an in puteum se coniciat. . . .' Apuleius *Met.* 8.7 alludes to the Laodamia myth: Charite, who will commit suicide with a sword, grieves for her dead husband by devoting herself to an image of him, in Bacchic rites (cf. 33–4n.). There is also a version of Laodamia's death in which she commits 'suttee', jumping onto the pyre onto which her father has thrown the image of Protesilaus:

> . . . quae ne diutius torqueretur, [Acastus] iussit signum et sacra pyra facta comburi, quo se Laodamia dolorem non sustinens immisit atque usta est.
>
> (Hyginus *Fab.* 104)

Ovid plays allusively with this version of Laodamia's suicide in the *Ars Amatoria* and *Remedia Amoris*.

> si potes, et ceras remove: quid imagine muta
> carperis? hoc periit Laodamia modo.
>
> (*Rem.* 723–4)

These lines are cited by Shuckburgh. The lover who pines over a likeness of the beloved is cheekily compared with Laodamia. Cf. *Ars* 2.353–6:

> Phyllida Demophoon praesens moderatius ussit,
> exarsit velis acrius illa datis;
> Penelopen absens sollers torquebat Ulixes;
> Phylacides aberat, Laodamia, tuus.

The poet gives *exempla* for the principle that absence makes the heart grow fonder. His reticence to describe Protesilaus' effect on Laodamia by his absence, when he has described the effect of Demophoon on Phyllis (*ussit, exarsit*) and of Odysseus on Penelope (*torquebat*), may stem from his awareness that Laodamia burned not, like Phyllis, with passion, but to death on a pyre—a detail which, given his argument, Ovid would be keen to suppress. Our passage also engages with this form of Laodamia's suicide. Laodamia's mention of the image is a worrying detail. Unlike the imagined return of her husband, and the envied Trojan couple, the wax image is, the reader suspects, no

harmless expression of Laodamia's frustrations. It will cause her to be burnt alive.

149 geres:
The mss. variously give *geres, geris, geras, feres,* and *feras* (cf. 37–40n.). Heinsius prints *geres*; all editors since follow, rightly. *dum* or sim. + future indicative is wholly regular, where the verb in the main clause denotes an event in the future:—i.e. when the verb in the main clause is future (many instances: note in *Her.* 10.74, 12.183, 13.117 and 139), gerundive + *est* (e.g. *Ars* 3.52 *dum vives, ista petenda tibi est,*[44] Varro *R.* 2.7.12 *dandum est . . . usque quoad erunt*), jussive subjunctive (*Ars* 1.578 *tu pete, dumque petes, sit tibi tacta manus*; some edd. have *dumque petis*) or, as here, present tense used of an action that will continue to hold good in the future ('as long as. . . .'; e.g. Plautus *Bac.* 225–6 *non metuo nec ego quoiiquam supplico,/dum quidem hoc valebit pectus perfidia meum, Rud.* 557–8 *tibi quidem edepol copiast,/dum lingua vivet, qui rem solvas omnibus*).

158:
'By the twin flames of love and marriage'. *pares* states that there are two equal *faces*, but may also imply reciprocal love, 'By our equal love for each other' (ironic: on suggestions that Laodamia's love is in fact not fully reciprocated, see 7ff.n., 65n.). *fax coniugii* = the marriage-torch, *OLD* s.v. *fax* 2: *fax animi* = the flame of passion, *OLD* s.v. *fax* 7, cf. 16.50 *pectoris ut nunc est fax fuit illa mei, Rem.* 434 *afflarant tepidae pectora vestra faces.*

159–60:
The couplet has been disputed. As the mss. transmit it, *ut* must be taken as = *utinam*, punctuating as follows:

> perque—quod ut videam canis albere capillis,
> quod tecum possis ipse referre!—caput

P, in which *ut* has been inserted interlinearly, also contains *utinam* as a gloss. But *ut* = *utinam* is not an Ovidian usage: see e.g. Kenney

[44] *vives* is Heinsius' conjecture for the *vivis* of the mss.

on 19.115. Particular suspicion has fallen on the pentameter 160. Ruhnken, quoted by Palmer *ad loc.*, asserts:

versus sine dubio vitiosus. nam *quod* abundat, et *tecum ipse* friget.

Vahlen (1882) 268 attempts to defend the paradosis. With *tecum* he compares Propertius 4.7.7–8 (of Cynthia's ghost) *eosdem habuit secum quibus est elata capillos,/eosdem oculos.* Concerning the repeated *quod,* he notes: 'neque *quod* iteratum in sententiis seiunctis alienum est'; one might compare e.g. 2.35–6. But *ut* = *utinam,* which he wishes to defend by citing 19.115, is indefensible.[45] Attempts have been made to repair the syntax. Heinsius suggests:

perque, quod o videam canis albere capillis,
    o [*or* huc] tecum possis ipse referre, caput

He compares 9.168 *virque—sed o possis!—et puer Hylle vale!,* the undisputed reading of the mss., and refers to his note on 1.101 for the corruption of *ut.* Others have focused their efforts to mend the couplet on the start of 160, conjecturing for *quod tecum* a word or phrase meaning 'safe and sound' and agreeing with *caput. tu* or *mox* with *tutum* or *laetum,* Riese, followed by Bornecque (*mox tutum*); *integrum,* Birt (1882) 852; *mox sospes,* Sedlmayer; *protectum,* Housman; *hoc salvum,* Reeve (1974) 63; *intactum,* Watt (1985) 57. The advantage of this approach is that 159 *ut* may now be taken as introducing a purpose clause subordinate to the relative clause. Cf. Bentley's *tu tecum.* Housman makes it explicit that he takes *ut . . . capillis* as a purpose clause, 'And by thy head, which mayest thou bring back unharmed for me to see white with old age'. Housman's own *protectum* seems the closest palaeographically to *quod tecum*; but Watt's *intactum* perhaps gives better sense.

One may, then, restore the couplet to make it syntactically sound:

perque—quod, ut videam canis albere capillis,
    intactum possis ipse referre—caput

In some such form the couplet is Ovidian, and should be kept. Palmer, although he acknowledges the conjectures, claims that they

[45] 19.115 *ut* has been variously emended. Even if one retains *ut* there, it will not be a sufficient parallel for *ut* in our line, since at 19.115 the sense *ut* = *utinam* would be helped by the *utinam* earlier in the same line (*o utinam venias! aut ut ventusve paterve . . .*).

merely repair the work of a clumsy interpolator ('verum ineptum est ineptissimo interpolatori patrocinari'), and enclosed 159–60 in square brackets. W. Peters (1882) declares the couplet spurious; Showerman-Goold, following Palmer, relegates it to the footnotes.[46] 159–60 can, it is true, be removed without affecting the sense of the surrounding lines: mention of the *caput* might perhaps be read as an afterthought tacked onto and suggested by mention of the *corpus* (157); and the sentiment of 159–60 may seem grotesque and overdone. However, Ovid can be as excessive as any interpolator; and both the manner in which the disputed couplet follows on from what precedes, and the black humour of 160 are characteristic of Ovid's style. The catalogue of things by which Laodamia swears, with repeated *per* at line beginning, follows an Ovidian pattern (Wills (1996) 409), and is, as often, tailored to the individual. The gods that invariably feature in oaths sworn by mortals are here substituted with Protesilaus himself, *corpusque tuum, mea numina.*[47] *mea numina* again recalls Laodamia's worship of Protesilaus' image (33–4n.); but the *numen* by which Laodamia swears is emphatically not the image, but rather Protesilaus in flesh and blood, *OLD* s.v. *corpus* 2b 'An animate body (and not a phantom, statue, etc.)'. Laodamia makes her oath by her living husband—an indication of the extreme distress to come when the *corpus* is taken away by death. 160 *caput* modifies the sense of *corpus* in retrospect: *corpus* is now simply 'The body without the head, the trunk', *OLD* s.v. *corpus* 7. On the oath by Protesilaus' *caput* Laodamia hangs an element of concern (*quod ut . . . referre*) to complement the desire and optimism in the oaths of 157–8. A wish for the return of a dear husband tempered by concerns for his safety has been a recurring theme of the epistle. The relative clause of 160 turns on a macabre joke. Burman attempts to explain the intensive pronoun:

> τo *ipse* non vacat hic. quia virorum, qui bello ceciderunt, cadavera in patriam ab aliis solebant referri; ut notissimum: Laodamia vero vovet, ut ipse salvus referat caput.

Shuckburgh follows ("". . . which I pray that you may be able to bring back home yourself," i.e. not have sent back, mere ashes in

---

[46] Contrast Goold (1974), who corrects Dörrie for not having noticed Housman's conjecture.

[47] For swearing by *numina*, see e.g. *Met.* 9.371. For variations on the basic motif, see e.g. *Her.* 16.321, *Trist.* 2.53; and compare with our lines *Her.* 15.107f.

the urn'), and even Palmer, who thinks 160 absurd, quotes Burman's note, terming it 'droll'. *ipse* does indeed make a contrast, but not, I think, with comrades envisaged as carrying back Protesilaus' corpse: this would be rhetorically weak, not least because the line concerns itself with the return of Protesialus' head, not his body. The return of Protesilaus' head, unharmed, by Protesilaus himself is contrasted with an alternative which, characteristically, Laodamia shrinks from making explicit: the return of Protesilaus' head as a spoil of war by a triumphant victor. For *caput referre* in this context, see *OLD* s.v. *refero* 1b, '(mil.) to bring back (spoils from the enemy; also the head of an enemy)'.

161–2:

'[I swear] that I will come as your companion, wherever you summon me [*vocaris*, contracted future perfect], whether you fare as I fear you will, or whether you survive.' A variation on the motif of the assiduous companion, for which see e.g. Nisbet-Hubbard (1978) on Horace *Carm.* 2.6.1 *aditure mecum*: 'To declare one's willigness to share arduous journeys was a conventional sign of devotion, formalized in the military oath. . . . The ends of the earth are often mentioned in such contexts. . . .' Our lines allude specifically to Catullus 11, perhaps the most famous instance. Ovid includes in our couplet two elements from that poem—*comitem* and *sive . . . sive . . .* — and frustrates the reader's expectations concerning their use. The motif generally includes a catalogue of distant places, expressing the extent of the companion's comradeship: in Catullus 11, the catalogue is framed in a succession of conditional clauses (2–9 *sive . . . sive . . . seu . . . sive . . . sive*). Ovid's Laodamia promises that she will go wherever Protesilaus summons her (161 *quocumque vocaris*); perhaps she hopes for an invitation to Troy (cf. 135ff.). In her case, however, the conditional clause expresses her devotion to her husband not, as the reader expects, to the ends of the earth, but rather in death as in life (162 *sive—quod heu! timeo—sive superstes eris*):—that she denotes 'death' by means of a suggestive anacoluthon is fully in keeping with her, by now familiar, superstitious nature. In the light of 162, the reader may note that there is more to 161 *comitem* than first seemed. In the *Amores*, Ovid had already established Laodamia as her husband's *comes* in death (2.18.38); he will make the same point again at *Ars* 3.17, *Pont.* 3.1.109–10 and *Trist.* 1.6.20. Laodamia

as *comes* derives, I think, from a pun on Virgil *Aen.* 6.447–8, where Laodamia is the *comes* of certain other heroines in the underworld.

163–4:

Just as the introductory couplets of some epistles in the collection have fallen under suspicion on the grounds that they give merely an address-formula in elegiacs, so some final couplets have come under attack for resembling a versified signing-off. Sedlmayer was the first to suspect our lines. Cf. Bornecque, who deploys square brackets. The final couplets of 13, 14, 20, and 21 all contain mention of the completion of the letter, and all have been suspected at one time or another. Reference to the act of laying down the pen has been regarded as an indication of an interpolator at work. In the case of our couplet, closure at 162 might seem attractive, as it does to Palmer ('totum hoc distichon spurium videtur. quanto melius in vs. 164 desineret epistola!', in his *ap crit.*; he did not mark 163–4 as spurious in his text). Laodamia's epistle would thus end with an oath: cf. *Her.* 8. But if 163–4 is an interpolation, it is skilfully done. Concluding a letter with a command is standard practice (in the *Heroides*, cf. 3, 10, and 11: the final couplets of 3 and 10 have not been contested); in Laodamia's case, it is especially appropriate: distraught at having missed the opportunity to give *mandata* to her departing husband (7, 13; cf. 141, with my note), she contents herself in the end with a *mandatum parvum* (163). This *mandatum*, expressed in 164, summarizes what has been Laodamia's chief concern throughout the epistle, in a highly Ovidian pentameter, *si tibi cura mei, sit tibi cura tui* (mangled by all but a handful of mss.; P has *si . . . si*, with *t*'s inserted above the line to give *sit . . . sit*). Pentameters with interchangeable halves are a favourite device of Ovid's (102n., 11.116n., 14.106n.; note esp. the (in)famous *semibovemque virum semivirumque bovem*, *Ars* 2.24), and this is a particularly effective example: 'Poeta hoc ultimo versu lectorem invitat ut quasi ludibundus voces *si* et *sit* quam aptissime discernat', Dörrie in his *ap. crit.* (a comment which Reeve (1974) 63 thought obscure). Cf. Knox on 15.40.

COMMENTARY ON *HEROIDES* 14
HYPERMESTRA TO LYNCEUS

Synopsis of the myth

Danaus and Aegyptus, sons of Belus and descendants of Io, father respectively fifty daughters and fifty sons. A quarrel over the kingship of Egypt breaks out between the brothers, which, according to a fragment from the lost epic *Danais*, escalates into full-blown warfare. When Aegyptus seeks to marry his sons to Danaus' daughters, Danaus is sensibly suspicious: Aegyptus wishes to prevent Danaus from marrying his daughters to another's sons and thus forming an alliance against him (Servius); in Hyginus' version, the intended marriage is a ruse to encompass the murder of Danaus and his family; and, according to the scholiast on Aeschylus' *Prometheus*, an oracle has warned Danaus to be wary of his nephews.

Danaus flees Egypt with Minerva's help, sailing in the first pentekonter, apparently with his daughters as oarswomen: the scholiast on Aeschylus' *Prometheus* draws attention to the correspondance between the number of oars and the number of Danaids, 'the famous fifty-oarer, to suit his fifty daughters'. After a short stop at Rhodes to dedicate an image to Minerva (pseudo-Apollodorus), Danaus and his daughters arrive at Argos, closely pursued by the sons of Aegyptus, who are intent on murdering their uncle; the sources disagree over whether or not Aegyptus accompanies his sons. In some versions, Danaus becomes king of Argos; and pseudo-Apollodorus and Hesiod describe how the Danaids discover springs in that previously unwatered land. Fighting breaks out between the two hostile parties. The Danaids' attempts to secure sanctuary and assistance from the native king Pelasgus is the subject of Aeschylus' extant play *Supplices*.

Eventually, Danaus agrees to marry his daughters to their cousins, but he has a grim ulterior motive. Arming his daughters with daggers on their wedding-day, he commands them to murder their grooms before the following morning. Forty nine daughters obey: Hyginus lists the murderers and their respective victims. Only Hypermestra spares her husband: her motives vary from version to version, and include fear, love, and gratitude for her spared virginity. Lynceus

flees from the bridal chamber, and lights a beacon to show to Hypermestra that he is safe (Pausanias 2.25.4). Danaus discovers Hypermestra's disobedience, and incarcerates her: it is at this point in the myth that Ovid's Hypermestra writes the epistle to Lynceus. She faces trial; but the Argives acquit her, and condemn the murderous Danaids instead. Lynceus appears to have been temporarily captured by Danaus in Theodectes' lost play *Lynceus*; but elsewhere he may have had a role in his wife's acquittal, and in some versions he returns as a murderous avenger, slaughtering Danaus and/or his forty nine obedient daughters.

A happy ending ensues for Hypermestra and Lynceus, whose son Abas founds a dynasty in Argos. The mythological tradition divides over the fate of the Danaids: death at the hands of Lynceus and an eternity filling leaky jars in the underworld; or purification and marriage to new grooms, who, in some accounts, are persuaded to marry murderesses by a new act of cunning by the ever-inventive Danaus: 'As nobody was willing to take a wife from among them because of the pollution, Danaus sent word that he would give them away without bride-gifts, and that each groom could choose whichever one pleased him for her beauty. Among the few suitors that came, Danaus held a running-race: the winner could choose before the others, and after him the second, and then so on until the last. The daughters that were left had to await the arrival of more suitors, and another foot-race' (Pausanias 3.12.2).

Sources

Adespota TrGF 454
Aeschylus *Danaides TrGF* 43–6, *Prometheus Bound* 853ff. and the scholiast there, *Supplices*
Danais fr. (see Johansen-Whittle (1980) 44)
Euripides *Archelaus* fr. 228 Nauck, *Hecuba* 886 and the scholiast there, *Hercules Furens* 1016, *Orestes* 871–3 and the scholiast there, Uncertain Play fr. 846 Nauck
Eustathius on Homer *Iliad* 1.42, 4.171
Hesiod *Inachi Progenies* fr. 127–8
Horace *Carmina* 3.11
Hyginus *Fabulae* 168, 170, 273
Lucretius 3.1003–10
Nonnus *Dionysiaca* 3.300ff.
Ovid *Amores* 2.2.4, *Ars Amatoria* 1.74, *Ibis* 177, 356, *Metamorphoses* 4.462–3, 10.43–4, *Tristia* 3.1.61–2

P. Oxy. 3702
Pausanias 2.15.5, 2.19.3–4, 2.19.6, 2.20.7, 2.21.1, 2.24.2, 2.25.4, 2.37.1, 2.38.2, 2.38.4, 3.12.2, 7.21.13, 10.10
Phrynicus fr. 1
Pindar *Nemeans* 10.6 and the scholiast there, *Pythians* 9.195 and the scholiast there
Propertius 4.7.63–8
pseudo-Apollodorus 2.1
Schol. Statius *Thebaid* 2.222
Theodectes *Lynceus TrGF* 3a
Virgil *Aen.* 10.497–8, and Servius there

LIMC s.v. *Danaides*, s.v. *Danaos*, s.v. *Hypermestra*,

The classic full study of the Danaid myth is C. Bonner (1902). On Aeschylus' Danaid trilogy, of which only the first play, *Supplices*, is extant, see A.F. Garvie (1969), H.F. Johansen – E.W. Whittle (1980), R.P. Winnington-Ingram (1961). Apuleius' Psyche, the heroine of the allegorical central section of his *Metamorphoses*, bears striking resemblance to Ovid's Hypermestra.

1–2:
The authenticity of the couplet was first doubted by Sedlmayer; others followed, claiming either that the epistle began with 3–4 (so G. Luck (1969) 32, G.P. Goold (1974) 484), or that 1–2 has displaced a genuine first couplet (so Borneque – M. Prévost, whose translation begins at 3 and is preceded by three ellipsis points). Reasons for doubting 1–2 are, for the most part, not given. It is transmitted in the entire tradition. Luck claimed only:

> Läst man sie weg, so beginnt der Brief ganz ähnlich wie Nr. 8

and conceded:

> . . . wir müßen auch aus andern Gründen auf sie verzichten. . . . Man müßte . . . von Vers zu Vers untersuchen—soweit sich eine solche Untersuchung durch führen läßt—, was für Ovid, was für die augusteische Zeit möglich und wahrscheinlich ist.

H. Jacobson (1974) 126 countered possible objections to the couplet: he defended *mittere* used absolutely and *de tot modo fratribus uni* (see nn. below); the use of the third person; and Luck's point, that 3–4 produces a better opening. A more important, but perhaps unresolvable, issue is Ovid's use of epistolary introductions (see intro.).

In this initial couplet, Hypermestra's writing is reserved and elliptical. See nn. below. Moreover, she addresses Lynceus only as one

of the sons of Aegyptus, not as her husband. This might be the result of a damaged text: it is possible that 1–2 is not the first but the second couplet of the epistle, the actual initial couplet having been lost (for the loss from the text of introductory couplets, see e.g. Kenney on 17.1–2). However, a formal tone and a reticence about her marriage are sustained, with a few notable lapses, throughout the epistle. Such formality is psychologically motivated: Hypermestra is unsure how she stands with Lynceus; when last he saw her, she was standing over her bed, sword in hand (76–7). Nor is the elliptical nature of the introduction only for Lynceus' benefit. The Danaid myth was well known. It was known to the father, anxious to acquire a good son-in-law, at Pindar *P.* 9.111ff.:

> . . . πατὴρ δὲ θυγατρὶ φυτεύων
> κλεινότερον γάμον, ἄκουσεν Δαναόν ποτ' ἐν Ἄργει
> οἷον εὗρεν τεσσαράκοντα καὶ ὀκτὼ παρθένοισι. . . .

It was famous in Euripides' day:

> ὁ φόνος ἦν ὃν Ἀργολὶς ἔχει πέτρα
> τότε μὲν περισαμότατος καὶ ἄπιστος Ἑλλάδι
> τῶν Δαναοῦ παίδων
>
> (*H.F.* 1016–8)

in Horace's:

> audiat Lyde scelus atque notas
> virginum poenas . . .
>
> (Horace *Carm.* 3.11.25–6)

and later:

> . . . τὰ δὲ ἀπὸ τούτου καὶ οἱ πάντες ὁμοίως ἴσασι, θυγατέρων τῶν Δαναοῦ τὸ ἐς τοὺς ἀνεψιοὺς τόλμημα. . . .
>
> (Pausanias 2.16.1)

Ovid's reader requires only the barest *mise-en-scène.* 1–2 should be retained.

1 mittit:
mittere used absolutely, 'to send word', is not uncommon, especially in the letters of Cicero (*TLL* s.v. *mitto* 1184.79ff.). Destination (e.g. *Her.* 1.63–5) or purpose of the message may be expressed; so too may content, in the form of indirect or direct statement or question dependent on *mittere.* E.A. Kirfel (1969) 99 goes so far as to take as

object of *mittit* here the (direct) statement given in 3, *clausa domo teneor* etc. He compares Seneca *Con.* 7.3.9:

> misit enim [Cicero] ad Laberium transeuntem: 'recepissem te, nisi anguste sederem.' Laberius ad Ciceronem remisit: 'atqui soles duabus sellis sedere.'

cf. also Cicero *Att.* 9.14.1:

> Caesarem ad se prid. Id. Mart. misisse hoc exemplo: 'Pompeius se oppido tenet *etc.* . . .'

But *mitto* + direct speech in our lines would be ungainly. The parenthesis of 2 would intervene between *mittit* and its 'object'; and, more crucially perhaps, there is no reason why 3 alone should be the direct speech after *mittit*: why not 3–132? For this there would be no parallel. Even the four sentences of direct speech after *mittere* at Cicero *Att.* 9.14 require introduction with the explanatory *hoc exemplo*. In our line, neither purpose nor content is expressed; cf. *Am.* 2.2.5:

> protinus, ut placuit, misi scriptoque rogavi

which, in spite of the explanatory *scriptoque rogavi*, seems parallel. Closer still is Cicero *Att.* 13.22.3, with dative of addressee as in our line:

> Varroni, simul ac te videro, si tibi videbitur, mittam.

Hypermestra:

> One thing we must not rely on Ovid's mss. to give us is Ovid's own spelling.
>
> (Goold (1974) 481)

On this occasion, however, what they give seems to accord with Ovidian orthographical practice in general, as far as that can be discerned. All mss. give *Hypermestra*, except one that gives *Hypermnestre*. They behave in the same way (if one can judge from the silence of the edd.) at 53 and 129; the name does not occur elsewhere in Ovid. That Ovid wrote *Hypermestra* is likely. *Hypermestre*, it is true, is equally Greek and, if Propertius' mss. can be believed, occurs at Prop. 4.7.63 and 67. But Ovid regularly retains the long final *-a* of Greek nominatives when metrically convenient (cf. Palmer *ad loc.*, R. Ehwald (1900) 11, and Kenney appendix p. 249). The penultimate syllable of this and similar names is variously given by mss. as *-mnes-*/-μνησ-

and *-mes-*/-μησ-, and the status of both is unsettled. One view is that the true form in both Latin and Greek is *-mnes-*/-μνησ- and that *-mes-*/-μησ- is a ms. corruption (so, apparently, Lewis-Short). Or *-mes-* is the true form in Latin, -μνησ- in Greek (so Palmer). However, the widely held view, and the most persuasive, is that the only true form in both Latin and Greek is *-mes-*/-μησ- and that *-mnes-*/-μνησ- is a late corruption, perhaps a Byzantine attempt to secure for such names a particular etymology (μνάομαι rather than μήδομαι); see Ehwald (1900) 11, O. Schroeder (1900) 30 (concerning Κλυταιμήστρα and Ὑπερμήστρα in Pindar), and E. Fraenkel (1950) on Aeschylus *Ag.* 84 Κλυταιμήστρα.

de tot modo fratribus uni:
A fine phrase, conveying much in five words; its recurrence at 73 is wholly justified. On self quotation in Ovid, see C. Ganzenmüller (1911) 397, '. . . Ovid fast maßlos bebaute Feld der Selbstwiederholung . . .', and 398ff. for a comprehensive catalogue. In this case, the epistolary framework gives an added twist to the repetition. The first occurrence of the phrase, chronologically speaking, is 73, where Hypermestra rouses Lynceus from sleep with a brutally concise summary of his predicament. There, the urgency of the situation (74) prevents her explaining further. Here, she qualifies the remark with an explanatory pentameter (2).

That Hypermestra alone of the Danaids spared her husband was a staple feature of the myth. Only scholiasts say otherwise ('a certain one or two', Eustathius on Homer *Il.* 1.42; Amymone and Hypermestra, Schol. on Pindar *P.* 9.195). The poets saw in Hypermestra's solitary abstinence from murder potential for a memorable phrase:

> μίαν δὲ παίδων ἵμερος θέλξει, τὸ μὴ
> κτεῖναι ξύνευνον. . . .
>
> (Aeschylus *Prom.* 865)
>
> . . . μονόψαπον ξίφος. . . .
>
> (Pindar *N.* 10.6)
>
> una de multis face nuptiali
> digna. . . .
>
> (Horace *Carm.* 3.11.33)

Ovid follows—with his emphatic *uni* at line end, compare Aeschylus' emphatic μίαν and Horace's *una*, both at line beginning—and adapts: he applies *unus* not to Hypermestra as the only bride to spare her

groom, but to Lynceus as the only groom to be spared. Hypermestra sees in Lynceus concrete proof of her own virtue (cf. 4n. *piam*). *modo*, qualifying *tot*, 'just now so many', is especially pleasing. In addition to serving as a temporal pointer—as Hypermestra writes, the gruesome wedding-night is not long past—, *modo* describes a particularly grim aspect of mass-murder: this extreme reversal of fortunes occurred in so short a space of time. Cf. Virgil *Aen.* 10.497 . . . *una sub nocte iugali* . . ., of the crime of the Danaids, represented on Pallas' baldric. *modo*, 'just now', qualifying an adjective is pre-Ovidian: citations at *TLL* s.v. *modo* 1307.84ff. include Livy 2.6.2 *ex tanto modo regno*, 3.67.1 *vix Hernicis modo pares*; it may have had its roots in πρίν or ἄρτι with adjective or participle. Ovid, however, made particular use of the device (*Her.* 14.88 *modo formosam*, 99–100 *modo . . . dives*, *Met.* 1.551 *modo tam velox*, 10.698 *modo levia*, 13.508 *modo maxima rerum*); and *modo* in a numerical phrase may have been a development of Ovid's (for *modo* so used, *TLL's* citations are all Ovidian, with one exception, and that from a late author: *Her.* 14.1 and 73, *Met.* 1.325 and 326 *de tot modo milibus*, 3.687 *de modo viginti*, *Trist.* 1.3.16 *modo de multis*, Curtius 6.10.31 *tot modo liberum*). Cf. *Her.* 16.343 *tot prius abductis*.

fratribus = 'brothers', from the standpoint of the victims, but perhaps also cousins (*OLD* s.v. *frater* 2) from Hypermestra's standpoint. Ovid plays with these two senses of *frater* and *soror* elsewhere in the epistle. *sorores* means 'sisters' at 15 and 57, and also at 117, where however it is paired with *fratres* = 'cousins'; 123 *sororis* = 'cousin', of Hypermestra's relationship to Lynceus. See also 95n. At 117, 122 and 130, Hypermestra uses *frater* to describe the sons of Aegyptus in relation to herself; 115 *de fratrum populo* may refer both to the sibling relationship ('from a crowd of brothers') and to the cousinly one ('from a crowd of my cousins').

Jacobson considers the address in our line, whether to 'one of so many brothers' or to 'one of so many cousins', peculiar:

> She addresses her husband in a manner which is at best straightforward and matter of fact, at worst formal and impersonal. He is not her lover, not her husband, just one of her cousins (or the survivor of a group of brothers). . . . But once does Lynceus receive the appellation *vir* (12) and once *maritus* (19).
>
> (Jacobson (1974) 126)

Hypermestra, he believes, addresses her husband as *frater* because she feels no conjugal love. He remarks on the 'total neglect of Amor

in Ovid's poem' (p. 140; cf. H. Isbell (1990) in his introduction to the epistle). See however 4n.

2 cetera . . . turba:
For *turba* = 'family', see *OLD* s.v. 5b, and R.P. Winnington-Ingram (1955) 140–1. Applied to a family as large as this one the word inevitably retains something of the sense 'crowd' (*OLD* s.v. *turba* 4): *turba* here refers to the fifty sons of Aegyptus, at 114 to the Danaids, at 118 to the sons of Aegyptus and the Danaids considered as two groups (but see n. there), and at 121 to all 100 cousins. Propertius had already used the word to describe the statues of the Danaids in front of the temple of Apollo on the Palatine:

> tanta erat in speciem Poenis digesta columnis,
> inter quas Danai femina turba senis.
>
> (Propertius 2.31.3–4)

Ovid too referred to these statues:

> . . . quae Danai porticus agmen habet.
>
> (*Am.* 2.2.4)

> signa peregrinis ubi sunt alterna columnis,
> Belides et stricto barbarus ense pater.
>
> (*Trist.* 3.1.61–2)

In our line, *turba* stands in stark contrast with *uni* in the hexameter.

nuptarum crimine . . . iacet:
An abstruse and euphemistic way of saying that their brides killed them. *iacere* = 'to lie dead' is common enough (*OLD* s.v. *iaceo* 6, *TLL* s.v. *iaceo* 7.25ff.), but may be considered particularly appropriate for these grooms who died in their beds. The absence of a qualifying phrase suggesting death (like those at 79 *ex caede iacentes*, *Met.* 7.521 *ossa cinisque iacent*, *Fast.* 3.707 *morte iacent merita*) is in itself not irregular (*Her.* 3.105–6 . . . *fratrum,/qui bene pro patria cum patriaque iacent*, *Met.* 1.720 *Arge, iaces*, 13.178 *per me iacet inclitus Hector!*, 495 *nata, iaces*); however, the ablative of instrument *crimine*, standing in for *ense* or sim. (*Met.* 5.97–8 *primus Hodites/ense iacet Clymeni*) is striking. *TLL* s.v. *iaceo* 9.33–8 'add. qua causa . . . crimine, dolis, insidiis' cites only our line and four Senecan instances, including *Phaed.* 1195 *iuvenisque castus crimine incesto iacet* which may draw on our line.

3:

Ovid plays with the bold speech that Horace's Hypermestra makes to Lynceus on the wedding-night:

> . . . ego illis
> mollior nec te feriam neque intra
> claustra tenebo.
>
> me pater saevis oneret catenis
> quod viro clemens misero peperci;
> me vel extremos Numidarum in agros
> classe releget.
>
> (Horace *Carm.* 3.11.42–8)

'I will not harm you, even if my father puts me in chains and sends me off to exile.' Ovid's Hypermestra, in comparison with Horace's, imagines crueler and more appropriate punishments from her father (9–11n.); for she is already in chains (Ovid's *gravibus coercita vinclis* picks up Horace's *saevis oneret catenis*), under lock and key, awaiting trial (see further on 6–7 *rea . . . ream*). Ovid communicates this situation by means of allusive details. Her imprisonment is narrated in Pseudo-Apollodorus' version of the myth:

> αἱ δὲ κοιμωμένους τοὺς νυμφίους ἀπέκτειναν πλὴν Ὑπερμνήστρας· αὕτη γὰρ Λυγκέα διέσωσε παρθένον αὐτὴν φυλάξαντα· διὸ καθείρξας αὐτὴν Δαναὸς ἐφρούρει.
>
> (*Bib.* 2.1.5.)

It may also have featured in a lost Greek tragedy. R. Seaford (1990) examines the literary motif of the imprisoned female, discussing several examples, including Hypermestra:

> In various accounts of the myth of the Danaids, Danaos told his daughters to murder their husbands and locked up Hypermestra when she failed to do so. This may have occurred in Aeschylus' version.
> (Seaford (1990) 81)

The motif is particularly appropriate to the Hypermestra myth. Seaford notes (p. 76) that the woman's imprisonment generally has an association with her excessive adherence to, or violation of, her link with blood-kin. Hypermestra may be considered guilty of both: excessive allegiance to her cousin, and disobedience to her father. That an imprisoned Hypermestra featured in a Greek tragedy is very likely: the motif belongs in particular to that genre, where imprisonment inside the family home (cf. *domo* in Ovid) can be conveniently and appropriately represented (Seaford 89–90). Ehwald (1900)

11, like Seaford (p. 81), thinks Aeschylus' incomplete Danaid trilogy a likely candidate. On the imprisoned female elsewhere in Aeschylus, see Seaford p. 85. There are however other possibilities, including Euripides. See Jacobson (1974) 124–5 for a catalogue of lost treatments of the Danaid legend.

4:

Ovid is fond of paradoxes expressed in a single pentameter: cf. e.g. 11.34n. In Hypermestra's case, he was doubtless unable to resist the challenge of Horace's celebrated *periurum . . . in parentem/splendide mendax* (*Carm.* 3.11.34–5, of Hypermestra): the motif of the 'virtuous crime', which can be traced back to Sophocles' *Antigone* (esp. 74 ὅσια πανουργήσασ' and 923–4 ἐπεί γε δὴ/τὴν δυσσέβειαν εὐσεβοῦσ' ἐκτησάμην), appears in our epistle in three different forms (4, 6, 120), and is suggested elsewhere (e.g. 71n. *lucemque*). See Jacobson (1974) 129, 396. Palmer is unimpressed even by the best of them:

> Above all is Horace's eleventh ode of his third book known. It is plain that Ovid knew that poem well; and he vainly attempts to rival Horace's *splendide mendax* with his *rea laudis*, ver. 120.
>
> (Intro. to *Her.* 14)

The florilegia, however, found our line particularly to their taste, once it had been altered to suit their male readership (those that include it give *pium* for *pia/piam*).

Hypermestra insists that her sparing of Lynceus was an act of *pietas*. See Jacobson:

> *pietas*, in its nominal and adjectival forms, occurs no less than seven times in the 132 verses of the poem [4, 14, 49, 64, 84, 123, 129], while no more than three times in any other of the *Heroides*. More important is the fact that all these instances of 'piety' in *Her.* 14 refer to Hypermestra herself (line 14 is a generalization which applies to her), while only two of the other heroines mention their own piety, each once (*H.* 1.85, 6.137).
>
> (Jacobson (1974) 125)

The insistence of Ovid's Hypermestra that she is *pia* may owe something to Horace's insistence that her sisters were *impiae*:

> impiae nam (quid potuere maius?),
> impiae sponsos potuere duro
> perdere ferro.
>
> (Horace *Carm.* 3.11.30–2)

The question of 'piety' may have been raised in Aeschylus' Danaid trilogy: Winnington-Ingram (1961) 145, speculates that, in the lost *Aegyptii*, Danaus appealed to the filial piety of his daughters in order to persuade them to murder their grooms.

Hypermestra's motives in sparing Lynceus vary from version to version (cf. C. Bonner (1902) 132). In Aeschylus *Prom.*, she responds to both love and fear:

> μίαν δὲ παίδων ἵμερος θέλξει τὸ μὴ
> κτεῖναι σύνευνον, ἀλλ' ἀπαμβλυνθήσεται
> γνώμην· δυοῖν δὲ θάτερον βουλήσεται,
> κλύειν ἄναλκις μᾶλλον ἢ μιαιφόνος
>
> (*Prom.* 865–8)[1]

Love features in the versions at Schol. Pindar *P.* 9.195a:

> Ὑπερμήστρα δὲ ἐρασθεῖσα Λυγκέως

Schol. Euripides *Hec.* 886:

> ἡ Ὑπερμήστρα ἐφείσατο τοῦ Λυγκέως, ἀπὸ τῆς μίξεως διάθεσιν ἐσχηκυῖα πρὸς αὐτόν.

and Nonnus *Dionysiaca* 3.312:

> ἔπλετο δ' ἀμφοτέρων ὅσιος γάμος.

Note too Pausanias 2.20.7, where Hypermestra dedicates a wooden image to Aphrodite; and, in art, the 'Lynceus cup', on which see *LIMC* s.v. *Hypermestra* 6 for one interpretation. Horace's Hypermestra claims she is too *mollis* to harm Lynceus (3.11.43); but she too mentions love (50 *dum favet nox et Venus*). The Hypermestra in Propertius' Elysium claims that she simply could not dare so great a crime:

> narrat Hypermestre magnum ausas esse sorores,
> in scelus hoc animum non valuisse suum.
>
> (Propertius 4.7.67–8)

[1] Some scholars have thought that *Prom.* 865 refers not to Hypermestra's love for her groom, but rather to a desire to have children, taking παίδων with ἵμερος. But ἵμερος is almost certainly absolute, and παίδων partitive genitive after μίαν. For a list of those who take παίδων with ἵμερος, see A.F. Garvie (1969) 225; for a persuasive refutation of their position, see Winnington-Ingram (1961) 147, and note besides Jacobson (1974) 139–40, who draws attention to the scholiast's interpretation of the line:

> . . . μία δὲ θελχθεῖσα ὑπὸ τοῦ ἔρωτος οὐκ ἀεῖλε τὸν ἑαυτῆς νυμφίον, ἀλλ' εἴασε ζῆν· περὶ ἧς καὶ ὁ ποιητὴς οὗτός φησι.

Elsewhere, Hypermestra spares Lynceus because he allowed her to remain a virgin:

> αὕτη γὰρ Λυγκέα διέσωσε παρθένον αὐτὴν φυλάξαντα.
>
> (Pseudo-Apollodorus *Bib.* 2.1.5)

> μόνη ἡ Ὑπερμήστρα, ἐπεὶ διεφύλαξεν αὐτὴν ἁγνὴν παρθένον ὁ Λυγκεύς, οὐκ ἐφαίνετο ἰσόψηφος ταῖς ἀδελφαῖς.
>
> (Schol. Pindar *N.* 10a)

see too Euripides *Archelaus* fr. 2.4 Austin, . . . οὐκ ἔψαυσε· Λυγκέως. . . . Ἄ[β]ας ἐγένετο, with Austin there, 'ἔψαυσε sc. Lynceus Hypermestram. . . .'

In Aeschylus' Danaid trilogy, Hypermestra's motivation seems to have been love. *TrGF* Aeschylus 44 is part of a speech made by Aphrodite in the *Danaides*, in which she extolls her own powers. Most scholars have held that in the *Danaides* Hypermestra spared Lynceus because she loved him, whether they attribute Aphrodite's speech to a defence of Hypermestra, or else (so e.g. Winnington-Ingram (1961) 143) to a reconciliation of the other Danaids to marriage. See further Garvie (1969) 205. Only a minority have attributed to the Hypermestra of the *Danaides* some motivation other than love (T. Birt (1877) 426 *pietas*, S. Jaekel (1973), *passim, timor et pietas*: both extrapolate back from Ovid to Aeschylus).

In Ovid's epistle, Hypermestra's motivation for sparing Lynceus is a contentious issue. References to love, fear, and even spared virginity (55n.) can all be found. Hypermestra's professed *pietas* has been regarded as the dominant motivating factor in Ovid's epistle, with *amor* nowhere to be seen, and *timor* ineffectively suppressed. See Jacobson (1974) 124–141 passim, esp.

> Striking for its absence in this 'love letter' is love, no *amo*, no *amor* (only *Her.* 10 shares this characteristic); and, to anticipate a bit, this bare statistic is reinforced by the tone of the whole poem. There is no evidence of affection. On the other hand, we are certainly put in the presence of great and devout virtue. . . .
>
> (p. 125)

> Underneath her mask, she is weary, anxious, fearful.
>
> (p. 131)

> . . . chinks in her armour of piety are visible. . . .
>
> (p. 132)

See also Isbell (1990) 124–5. However, in asserting *pietas*, Hypermestra merely asserts that she did the right thing, not why she did it; cf.

Ehwald (1900) 10, 'Ovid läßt die Hypermestra als Märtyrerin der *pietas* auftreten; worin diese selbst ihre sittliche Berechtigung hat, sagt er uns nicht. . . .' Any number of motives can be embraced by *pietas*, including a sense of 'wifely affection' (Palmer on 49). Fear, far from being a chink in the armour of *pietas*, is presented as its natural complement: the two occur side by side here (4–5 *piam/. . . extimuit*) and at 49.[2] *timor* and *pietas* do not sit together as uncomfortably as has been claimed: ambiguity surrounding Hypermestra's motivation seems to a have been a staple part of the myth. Note the versions at Aeschylus *Prom.* 865–8 (love and cowardice), Propertius 4.7.67–8 (cowardice, yet the deed is a glorious one, 63), Horace *Carm.* 3.11 (cowardice, love, a glorious deed). The *pietas* that Hypermestra claims for herself is vague, not specific. This inexactitude allows Hypermestra to be coy to her addressee about her reason for sparing him; and it allows Ovid to play allusive games with the various motives found in other versions (cf. intro.).

piae:
A verb that takes the dative introduces the infinitive *esse*; should the predicate be dative or accusative? Most editors of this epistle seem to have relied on the mss., and in particular on the 'best' ms., to settle the matter. In our line, all mss. give *piam*; Heinsius and Bentley, apparently independently of each other, conjectured *piae*, but subsequent editors have preferred to follow the mss. However, at 64, a line syntactically and structurally very similar to ours, P gives the dative *piae* against the *piam* of the other mss.: all editors except Dörrie print *piae*. Ms. evidence is worth next to nothing when the issue turns on a single letter, and when the scribes may have had their own ideas on what was standard grammatical practice. For their own part, modern scholars have formulated a rule concerning the case of the predicate in such expressions: that both accusative and dative are correct Latin; that when the dative subject is expressed (*mihi* in our line), the predicate would normally be attracted into the dative; that when it is not expressed, the predicate can be either accusative or dative, the dative being perhaps the more regular; and that, very occasionally, the dative noun is expressed but the predi-

[2] Jaekel (1973) 246ff. argues that both *timor* and *pietas* refer explicitly to the marriage ritual which Hypermestra is afraid to profane. His argument is not persuasive.

cate is accusative. See e.g. Palmer on 64, K-S 1.679–80. It is clear, however, that this 'rule' is based on the unreliable testimony of the mss. One might argue that where the dative is given by one or more mss., it is likely to be correct, since the dative is the *lectio difficilior*—an argument shaky enough in itself, not least because any dative may be a 'learned' scribal conjecture. But when, as in our line, the mss. give universal support to the accusative, one cannot know whether or not the whole tradition is corrupt. Thus e.g. the instances given by K-S for accusative predicate with dative subject expressed are insecure, since we have only ms. evidence to rely upon; metre will not help, since all the instances except one are prose; in the exception, Horace *S.* 1.4.39, either dative or accusative would scan (*dederim quibus esse poetis/poetas*). The older commentators and the scholia appeal to 'elegance' in making the choice: see e.g. Heinsius on our line and at 64, and A.J. Macleane (1869) on Horace loc. cit.

Metre is of limited help in establishing Ovidian practice. On two occasions in Ovid, the predicate is dative; the accusative will not scan:

> . . . nec fortibus illic
> profuit armentis nec equis velocibus esse. . . .
>
> (*Met.* 8.554–5)

> vobis inmunibus huius
> esse mali dabitur
>
> (*Met.* 8.690–1)

In both instances, the dative (pro)noun is expressed (*armentis, equis*; *vobis*). The most one can conclude is that Ovid was happy to use the dative predicate if the dative subject was expressed. Whether he used the accusative, and, if so, under what circumstances, cannot be securely established: I have found no instances where metre demands the accusative. If Ovid used the accusative at all, it is likely that the word-order and rhetorical structure of the particular line determined the preference. One might speculate, to take an extreme example, that where the dative subject is not expressed and the predicate is juxtaposed with the *esse*, the accusative would be more likely. At *Met.* 8.554–5 and 690–1, where the dative subject is expressed, the dative predicate is found close to that noun; in our line and at 64, the dative subject and the predicate are at opposite ends of the line; and moreover the predicate is juxtaposed with the *esse*: would the predicate be attracted into the dative by the dative subject even so? Or would it form an accusative and infinitive construction with the *esse*?

The point cannot be settled satisfactorily. Because there is no hard evidence that Ovid used the accusative in such sentences, I tentatively print *piae*, both here and at 64: the structure of the two lines is similar enough to suggest the same practice at both. On the resultant jingle at 63–5 *ipsae . . . piae . . . puellae*, see 65–6n.

On adjectives as the final word of the pentameter, see M. Platnauer *LEV* 42ff. Our epistle contains four such pentameters in all. Platnauer quotes our line as a clear-cut example of a pentameter brought to a close by a predicative adjective; 14 *pia* and 64 *piae* may be classified under the same heading. One may categorize both 114 *inops* and 128 *brevi* as 'adjectives necessary to the sense' (*LEV* 43–4); but, arguably, the latter, at least, refuses to be pigeon-holed: Platnauer *LEV* cites it among the '*epitheta ornantia*' (p. 47), but elsewhere (p. 44) stresses that there is no reliable means of determing what constitutes a 'necessary' and what an 'ornamental' adjective.

5–6:
An elaboration of the paradox set out in 4. The chiastic arrangement, with *sum rea* and *laudarer* juxtaposed, draws attention to the contrast between the alternative courses of action and their respective consequences.

Hypermestra here presents the murder of the sons of Aegyptus as a bold deed, which she did not dare accomplish (*extimuit, ausa forem*); cf. 49 *ausis*. The claim that Propertius' Hypermestra makes in Elysium (4.7.67–8 *narrat Hypermestre* etc., quoted under 4n.) is incorporated into Ovid's epistle; cf. Horace *Carm.* 3.11.30. For the grooms' murder as an act of daring, cf. Aeschylus *Prom.* 866–8 (quoted under 4n.) and Pausanias 2.16.1 (quoted under 1–2n.).

5 manus:
This gentle personification of *manus* (*manus extimuit*) is the starting point for a major motif (cf. 8, 18, 19–20n., 44, 46, 50, 56, 59–60, 66, 76, 131–2). It is discussed by e.g. H. Fraenkel (1945) 21 and 182, Jacobson (1974) 132–4, and F. Spoth (1992) 193ff. The personification of the *manus* clearly interested Ovid. He had already explored the motif in *Am.* 1.7 (cited by e.g. Fraenkel and Spoth), where the poet describes how his hands offered violence to his mistress. Fraenkel 82 discusses the similarities between the two passages; a crucial difference is that, while the poet in *Am.* 1.7 asks for his hands to be punished for their crime (1.7.1 *adde manus in vincla meis (meruere catenas)*), Hyper-

mestra complains that her hands are being punished for having behaved correctly (cf. Spoth (1992) 194). More crucial still is the difference in tone, between murder and a lovers' tiff.

In applying the *manus* motif to Hypermestra's case, Ovid may have drawn on earlier versions of the myth. Pindar *N.* 10.6 personified Hypermestra's sword, making it, as much as Hypermestra herself, responsible for Lynceus' survival (μονόξαφον . . . ξίφος). Two Greek post-Ovidian versions denote Hypermestra's non-participation in the murder as 'keeping her hands clean' (Pausanias 10.10.5 Ὑπερμήστρα δὲ ἅτε καθαρὰ χεῖρας μόνη τῶν ἀδελφῶν and Nonnus *Dionysiaca* 3.311 (of Hypermestra) καὶ καθαρὴν ἐφύλαξεν ἀναίμονα χεῖρα σιδήρου; both are cited by Jacobson (1974) 133); cf. *immunes caedis . . . manus* (8). One cannot rule out the possibility of a common predecessor for Pindar, Ovid, Pausanias, and Nonnus, which included this motif in a Danaid context—perhaps even Aeschylus (if indeed Aeschylus' trilogy predates Pindar *N.*; see H.F. Johansen – E.W. Whittle (1980) 1.21ff.). But more tantalizing, and perhaps more fanciful, than pre-Ovidian references to Hypermestra's hands, is Virgil *Aen.* 10.496–9:

> . . . rapiens immania pondera baltei
> impressumque nefas: una sub nocte iugali
> caesa manus iuvenum foede thalamique cruenti,
> quae Clonus Eurytides multo caelaverat auro.

manus there = 'group, band' (*OLD* s.v. *manus* 22), but it is characteristic of Ovid to appropriate Virgil for his own ends. Cf. his use of *comes* in the Laodamia myth (13.161–2n.).

It is generally agreed that the personification of the *manus*, both in Hypermestra's epistle and in *Am.* 1.7, distances the character from his or her actions. See, on *Her.* 14, Jacobson (1974) 133:

> There is, in short, a virtual dissociation of her hand from herself

and, on *Am.* 1.7, Fraenkel (1945) 21:

> . . . speaking to his own limbs as if they were something apart from himself

J.C. McKeown (1989):

> . . . dissociating himself from his hands
> (on *Am.* 1.7.1–2)

> . . . Ovid's attempt to dissociate himself from his hands' heinous deeds
> (on *Am.* 1.7.3–4)

> The purpose of the address is to divert the blame from himself, as if his hands had an identity distinct from his own
>
> (on *Am.* 1.7.27–8)

The reasons for such 'distancing' are more obvious in *Am.* 1.7 than in *Her.* 14. In *Am.* 1.7, the lover attempts to divert blame from himself by making his hands the guilty party (cf. McKeown on 27–8); the deed attributed to the hands is one which the lover regrets. The same is not true of Hypermestra. The sparing of Lynceus is an act of which she is proud, not regretful (note esp. 13–4). But interestingly, while Hypermestra attributes righteous action to herself (4, 13–4, etc., and esp. 129–30), it is, by her own account, the *manus* that forbore to murder Lynceus. Note esp. 47–50, where Hypermestra moves to cut Lynceus' throat (47–8), but the hand fails to comply (50). It is as if the enormity of sparing Lynceus, and more importantly the enormity of the consequences (imprisonment and trial by her father), are too much for Hypermestra to bear.

iugulo demittere ferrum:
'To thrust the sword into the throat'; a brutal expression; *OLD* s.v. *demittere* 3c, and *TLL* q.v. 491.41ff. For *demittere* in this sense with a dative of destination, cf. e.g. *Met.* 13.436 *iuguloque sui demisit alumni.* The majority of mss. on our line give *dimittere*; but, as Burman notes, sense requires the prefix *de-*, = 'down', rather than *di-*, = 'away'. *de-*)(*di-* is among the commonest of corruptions.

Hypermestra was to slay Lynceus by cutting his throat—an order she almost carried out, as she later admits (47–8). No other version of the myth mentions throat-slitting, although sword or dagger is regularly mentioned as the weapon with which the Danaids murdered their grooms. Note however the detail whereby the sons of Aegyptus are decapitated after their death:

> χωρὶς μὲν γὰρ ἀπὸ τῶν σωμάτων ἐνταῦθα αἱ κεφαλαί, χωρὶς δὲ ἐν Λέρνηι σώματα τὰ λοιπά· ἐν Λέρνηι γὰρ καὶ ὁ φόνος ἐχειργάσθη τῶν νεανίσκων, ἀποθανόντων δὲ ἀποτέμνουσιν αἱ γυναῖκες τὰς κεφαλὰς ἀπόδειξιν πρὸς τὸν πατέρα ὧν ἐτόλμησαν.
>
> (Pausanias 2.24.2)

> αἱ δὲ ἄλλαι τῶν Δαναοῦ θυγατέρων τὰς μὲν κεφαλὰς τῶν νυμφίων ἐν τῇ Λέρνῃ κατώρυξαν, τὰ δὲ σώματα πρὸ τῆς πόλεως ἐκήδευσαν.
>
> (Pseudo-Apollodorus *Bib.* 2.1.5)

Bonner (1902) 150 notes that throat-slitting appears as the murder-method in comparable myths.

The absence of the possessive adjective *tuo* for *iugulo* is notable. Palmer considered it an instance of 'want of finish' in this epistle. Jacobson's claim that the absence of *tuo* is deliberate seems right; but his inference that Hypermestra views Lynceus merely as a throat not to cut (Jacobson (1974) 127–8) is, I think, overstated. The lack of a *tuo* for *iugulo*, and indeed of a *mea* for *manus*, stems at least in part from Hypermestra's reluctance as yet to reveal explicitly that she undertook to kill Lynceus. Cf. 12n. and 45n.

6 laudarer:
The praise for her actions that Hypermestra fails to elicit from Danaus was freely given by the poets. See e.g. Garvie (1969) 207. Only Aeschylus' Prometheus is reserved in his commendation: of two evil names, he prophesies, Hypermestra will choose to be branded ἄναλκις rather than μιαιφόνος (Aeschylus *Prom.* 867–8, quoted under 7n.).

6–7 rea . . . ream:
To be taken literally. Hypermestra is in a dungeon (84 *carcer habet*), in chains (3), awaiting trial. Pausanias records the detail that Danaus brought Hypermestra to trial before the Argives—who subsequently acquitted her:

> ταύτην [sc. Ηψπερμεστρα] γὰρ . . . ὑπήγαγεν ὁ Δαναὸς ἐς δικαστήριον . . . κριθεῖσα δὲ ἐν τοῖς Ἀργείοις ἀποφεύγει. . . .
>
> (2.19.6)

> τὸ δὲ χωρίον τὸ ὄπισθεν καὶ ἐς τόδε Κριτήριον ὀνομάζουσιν, Ὑπερμήστραν ἐνταῦθα ὑπὸ Δαναοῦ κριθῆναι λέγοντες.
>
> (2.20.7)

> τὸ δὲ τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος ἱερὸν ἐπίκλησιν Πειθοῦς, Ὑπερμήστρα καὶ τοῦτο ἀνέθηκε νικήσασα τῆι δίκηι τὸν πατέρα ἣν τοῦ Λυγκέως ἕνεκα ἔφυγε.
>
> (2.21.1)

We cannot tell whether or not Aeschylus' trilogy depicted a trial for Hypermestra (see e.g. Johansen-Whittle (1980) 1.53–4), although several scholars have placed fr. 44 in such a context (cf. 4n.).

7:
Prometheus prophesied that Hypermestra would rather be branded a coward than a murderer:

> δυοῖν δὲ θάτερον βουλήσεται,
> κλύειν ἄναλκις μᾶλλον ἢ μιαιφόνος
>
> (Aeschylus *Prom.* 867 8)

An Ovidian paradox adds interest to this rather bland antithesis. Almost anyone would rather be called a coward than a murderer. Ovid's Hypermestra would, she claims, rather face trial than be a dutiful daughter under these unusual circumstances (7 *sic*).

8 immunes caedis . . . manus:
For Hypermestra's blood-free hands, cf. Pausanias 10.10.5 and Nonnus *Dionysiaca* 3.311, both quoted under 5n. *manus*. On *immunis* = 'taking no part in', see Palmer *ad loc.*

9–11:
Ovid seeks to better the punishments imagined by Horace's Hypermestra (*Carm.* 3.11.45–8, quoted under 3n.). Horace's Hypermestra imagined chains and exile. Ovid's Hypermestra is already in chains (3n.), and the imagined punishments are gruesome and appropriate: being burnt with the symbolic fire; having wedding-torches aimed at her face; having her throat slit with the very sword she was to have used against Lynceus. The allusion is confirmed by *me pater*, at line beginning in both cases.

9 pater:
Danaus looms large in Hypermestra's epistle (9, 15, 43, 48, 53, 71, 83, 111; see also 89–90n.). M. Ryzman (1989) argues that in the *Supplices*, Danaus is characterized as an overbearing father, and the Danaids as over-dependent daughters. Ovid's Hypermestra fits into this tradition; according to Ovid, even Hypermestra, who disobeyed Danaus, remains to a large extent under his spell.

igne:
The fire that Hypermestra would not profane, and which she imagines her father using to inflict violence against her, is that to which Servius refers in his note on *Aen.* 4.103 *Phrygio servire marito*:

> . . . quae conventio eo ritu perficitur, ut aqua et igni adhibitis, duobus maximis elementis, natura coniuncta habeatur. quae res ad farreatas nuptias pertinet. . . .

Ovid alludes to it at *Ars* 2.598:

> . . . quos faciet iustos ignis et unda viros

and at *Fast.* 4.791–2:

an, quod in his (sc. fire and water) vitae causa est, haec perdidit exul,
his nova fit coniunx, haec duo magna putant?

Cf. Egnatius and Ciofanus on our line, who cite Plutarch *Moralia* 263.1; Palmer *ad loc.*; and *TLL* s.v. *ignis* 292.63ff. Micyllus takes *igne* in our line to be intentionally vague, and Shuckburgh thinks it refers to the flames of the torches mentioned in 10; but the singular *igne* and the relative clause *quem non violavimus* tell against both these interpretations. Contrast e.g. *Met.* 9.796, 10.7, 12.215, and *Pont.* 1.2.131 (all cited by *TLL* s.v. *ignis* 290.84ff.), where the plural *ignes* in a matrimonial context either is vague ('wedding fires') or refers to the flames of the wedding torches.

10 tendat in ora faces:
'Aim the torches at my face'—a grim punishment; *OLD* s.v. *tendo* 1b 'to direct, aim (weapons; also, glances)'. T. Nissen (1941) thinks the expression not grim enough, and conjectures *trudat,* in support of which he cites Planudes' translation:

> εἰ γάρ με ὁ πατὴρ καὶ πυρὶ ὅπερ οὐκ ἐμολύναμεν καταφλέξει καὶ τὰς παρούσας τοῖς γάμοις δᾷδας εἰς τὸ πρόσωπον ὤσει. Das letzte Verbum zeigt, daß er nicht *tendat,* sondern *trudat* las; der weist stärkere Ausdruck stimmt zu 10 *urat* und 12 *iugulet* ungleich besser als das matte *tendat.*
> (Nissen 92)

But Planudes' ὤσει is as likely to be an imprecise translation as evidence for the text of the ms. he was using: for Planudean inaccuracies, see intro. *trudat,* moreover, is not found elsewhere in Ovid. *tendat in ora faces* lacks, it is true, the belligerent violence inflicted with torches elsewhere (at e.g. *Met.* 5.56–8, 12.271–3, 287–9, Virgil *Aen.* 12.298–300); however, with *tendat in ora faces,* Hypermestra is describing the brandishing of a flame and not the wielding of a torch as a blunt instrument. What the expression lacks in naked violence, it more than makes up for in menace; cf. *Ibis* 151–2:

quicquid ero, Stygiis erumpere nitar ab oris,
et tendam gelidas ultor in ora manus.

11:
Hypermestra imagines her death in the same manner (cf. 5, 47–8) and with the same sword (*quem non bene tradidit ensem*) with which she herself was to have killed Lynceus. The irony is spelled out in the pentameter. With *tradidit ensem* Palmer and Ehwald compare Pseudo-Apollodorus

Bib. 2.1.5, ἑστιάσας (sc. Danaus) ἐγχειρίδια δίδωσι ταῖς θυγατράσιν. Ovid's *non bene,* 'to no good purpose', is pleasingly euphemistic.

ensem:
The mss. divide between *ense* (ablative with *illo*) and *ensem* (antecedent incorporated into the relative clause). The majority of editors have *ensem*; Burman and Palmer have *ense* (cf. Goold (1974) 480). Both are grammatical and metrical. I prefer *ensem.* Ovid appears to have been fond of the idiom. See e.g. Kenney on 21.100; his citations include instances where *ille-a-ud* is not incorporated into the relative clause along with the antecedent it agrees with:

> hesterna vidi spatiantem luce puellam
> illa quae Danai porticus agmen habet.
> (*Am.* 2.2.3–4)

> forte revertebar festis Vestalibus illa
> quae Nova Romano nunc Via iuncta foro est.
> (*Fast.* 6.395–6)

Cf. also (not cited by Kenney) Horace *S.* 1.10.16:

> illi scripta quibus comoedia prisca viris est.

Note esp. Juvenal 3.91 (cited by Kenney), which has in common with our line not only the *ille* but also similar word-order:

> miratur vocem angustam, qua deterius nec
> ille sonat quo mordetur gallina marito?
> (Juvenal 3.90–1)

All mss. there have *marito.*

12:
Here and at 19, Hypermestra mentions her conjugal relationship with Lynceus. *Pace* Jacobson, she does seem to regard Lynceus as her husband, and not as 'nothing more than an integral component of her heroic act' (Jacobson (1974) 127–8). She is, however, for the moment, keen not to state explicitly that she nearly killed him, nor even that she was instructed by her father to do so. Thus she claims 'he did not die' (*non cecidit*), rather than a more truthful 'he almost died'. One might prefer *cadat,* a minor ms. reading and perhaps an early conjecture, to the paradosis *cadam*: thus both bride and groom are unidentified ('that the bride might die the death the groom did not die'). On the heroic tone of *cadam,* cf. 122n.

13 ut dicant morientia . . . ora:
ora picks up 10 *ora*, but here stands for Hypermestra herself: 'that my dying lips may say . . .' = 'that I might say as I die'. The effect is the same as that achieved by the personification of the *manus* (see 5n. *manus*). Francius' conjecture *ut dicam morienti . . . ore* (reported by Burman) spoils the point.

14 non est, quam piget esse, pia:
The *sententia* is economically phrased, and the alliteration *piget . . . pia* picks out the important words.

pia is Bentley's conjecture; he is followed by M.D. Reeve (1974) 62, and by Goold (1974) 479 who also prints *pia* in his revision of Showerman (1914/1977). The majority of editors prefer the *piam* of the mss. *piam* is inferior to *pia*, because only with considerable ambiguity does it give the required sense, 'She is not righteous who is ashamed of being so'. Ehwald, Showerman, and Shuckburgh all think that *piam* can provide this sense, understanding *pia* with *non est*. But, as Reeve (1974) 62 implied ('The transmitted text is disproved by her sisters, to go no further'), *piam* would more readily give the meaning 'There is no woman who is ashamed of being righteous'—nonsense in context (but seemingly how Planudes interprets the line, οὐ γὰρ ἔστιν ἣ ἂν μεταμέλοι τοῦ εὐσεβῶς διαγεγονέναι). Even before Bentley, *non est quam piget esse piam* was disliked and conjectures were made. Thus some scribes conjectured:

> non sum quam piget esse piam.
> I am not a woman who is ashamed to be righteous.

Heinsius, followed by Bornecque-Prévost, and found as the reading of one ms. by Dörrie:

> non es quam piget esse piam.
> You [sc. Hypermestra] are not a woman who is ashamed to be righteous.

Burman, following one ms.:

> non es cui piget esse piam.
> You [sc. Lynceus] are not someone for whom I am ashamed to be righteous.

Ehwald (1900) 12 claims that *non est quam piget esse piam* would, in fact, unambiguously give the required meaning, 'She is not righteous who is ashamed to be so', since the sense 'There is no-one who is ashamed to be righteous' would require the subjunctive.

Strictly speaking, Ehwald was right to claim that the choice of mood removes any ambiguity, but *non est quam piget esse piam* is not as lucid as he claimed: after all, not even Heinsius was able to extract the required sense from it.

non est, quam piget esse, pia is clear and unambiguous. The reason that *pia* has not met with universal approval is a metrical one.

> . . . it certainly looks as though Ovid at least avoided ending his pentameters with -ă where he reasonably could.
>
> (Platnauer *LEV* 66)

The claim is unhelpful and misrepresentative of the facts. Indisputable instances of -ă as pentameter ending occur in the single-letters of the *Heroides* at 5.30 *aqua*, 5.54 *aqua*, 10.46 *tua*, and 14.86 *dea*. In the double letters, Kenney on 18.172 *freta* cites 18.174 *aqua* and 20.242 *rata*; he nevertheless subscribes to Platnauer's view that Ovid dislikes ending his pentameters in this way. Platnauer's qualification of his own claim is worth noting:

> In view of the scarcity of words of the type (˘)ă, (˘)ĕ, and (˘)ŏ, it would be rash to generalize, but it certainly looks as though Ovid etc.

A possible further instance of -ă at pentameter end in the *Heroides* is 5.22:

> et legor Oenone falce notata tua

tua is either ablative with *falce* or nominative with *Oenone*.

15 paeniteat:

paeniteat indignantly picks up 13 *paenitet*: 'He'll not make me repent—let him and my sisters repent.' Ovid may have been familiar with a branch of the myth in which Danaus and his daughters do indeed repent of their crime. See Pseudo-Apollodorus' rather compressed account:

> αἱ δὲ ἄλλαι τῶν Δαναοῦ θυγατέρων τὰς μὲν κεφαλὰς τῶν νυμφίων ἐν τῇ Λέρνῃ κατώρυξαν, τὰ δὲ σώματα πρὸ τῆς πόλεως ἐκήδευσαν. καὶ αὐτὰς ἐκάθηραν Ἀθηνᾶ τε καὶ Ἑρμῆς Διὸς κελεύσαντος. Δαναὸς δὲ ὕστερον Ὑπερμήστραν Λυγκεῖ συνῴκισε, τὰς δὲ λοιπὰς θυγατέρας εἰς γυμνικὸν ἀγῶνα τοῖς νικῶσιν ἔδωκεν.
>
> (Pseudo-Apollodorus *Bib.* 2.1.5)

With Pseudo-Apollodorus' detail of the Danaids burying their grooms' heads as part of a purification rite, cf. Pausanias 2.24.2; with the

marriage of the Danaids to new grooms, cf. Pindar *P.* 9.112, Pausanias 3.12.2, and Hyginus *Fab.* 273 (where the marriage takes place after Danaus' death); cf. also Pausanias 2.37.1, where the Danaids, presumably reconciled, dedicate a statue to Aphrodite, and Danaus builds a sanctuary of Athena. It has been claimed that the reconciliation of the Danaids was presented in Aeschylus' trilogy: Winnington-Ingram (1961) attributes the fragment of Aphrodite's speech in the *Danaides* (Aeschylus fr. 44 Nauck) to an attempt at such a reconciliation (cf. 4n.). The reader of *Her.* 14 might try to imagine that a similar outcome awaits Ovid's Danaids; and that Hypermestra, who believes she will be put to death unless rescued by Lynceus, inadvertently hints in this line at a more favourable outcome. Other versions of the myth, however, record a less fortunate fate for the Danaids: death at the hands of Lynceus (117n.); or futile water-carrying in the underworld, on which see e.g. *Met.* 4.462–3, and C.D.N. Costa – E.W. Whittle (1973).

Danaum saevasque sorores:
A variation on Horace's *socerum et scelestas . . . sorores* (*Carm.* 3.11.39–40), with some of the disdainful sibilance retained. From early on in the myth, 'a certain Amazon-like severity or even ferocity in appearance and character was sometimes attributed to the Danaids' (Bonner (1902) 152).

16:
'This is the outcome that usually follows evil deeds.' *hic . . . eventus* = repentance by the sinner(s). *solet* is wonderfully terse. For versions of the myth where Hypermestra's own case proves in fact to be no exception to the rule, see 15n. *paeniteat.*

17 admonitu:
'Remembrance'; *OLD* s.v. *admonitus* 1b. Writing of the *facta nefanda* has brought back memories of the wedding-night. The word *admonitus*—which always occurs in the ablative case, with one late exception (Martianus Capella 9.896, A.D. 5th century, nominative plural)—was introduced into verse by Ovid, and he makes good use of it (17 occurrences given by R.J. Deferrari (1939); cf. *TLL.* s.v. *admonitus* 769.27 'voce Ov. potissimum utitur'). Cf. Ehwald (1900) 13, C. Lucke (1982) on *Rem.* 629.

temeratae sanguine noctis:
Jacobson suggests that the phrase represents a *double entendre*:

> The prime—and surface—reference is to the bloody murder of the bride-grooms. But since it is also a wedding-night, *temeratae sanguine noctis* could allude to the sexual initiation of the virgin brides, especially since *temero* is often used, especially by Ovid, of sexual 'violation'. In the *Heroides* see 5.101, 9.49.
>
> (Jacobson (1974) 140)

This would, it is true, be a neat point: one might expect the wedding-night (*nox*) to be *temerata sanguine*, but not with the grooms' blood. On *temero* of sexual 'violation', see further J.N. Adams (1982) 199; and for *sanguis*, see *Met.* 6.529, where the raped Philomela is compared with a dove whose feathers are stained with blood. I doubt, however, whether the point is to be felt here. *temero*, which refers especially to the desecration of what is sacred, is regularly applied to the violation of marriages or of relationships viewed as marriages (*OLD* s.v. *temero* 2b; cf. e.g. McKeown (1989) on *Am.* 1.8.19). Our line represents a natural extension of that usage: the verb is applied to a night made sacred by the wedding ceremony (cf. Palmer *ad loc.*: 'The night should not have been profaned; it had been sanctified by the religious rite of matrimony'); it is not here suggestive of the deflowering of brides. *sanguine* is a nice touch: it elicits from *temeratae* undertones of a more physical meaning (*OLD* s.v. *temero* 4, 'To pollute, defile'): the wedding-night has been stained with blood.

18 praepedit:
The verb occurs in Ovid only here, and is rare in verse (but see Lucretius 3.364 *lumina luminibus quia nobis praepediuntur*). The minor variant *concutit* (cf. 3.82 *concutit ossa metus*) is probably a gloss.

ossa:
dextrae . . . ossa is a striking phrase. Heinsius gives parallels for *ossa* as the object of *tremor, timor*, etc., but in each of them *ossa* is unqualified and refers to all the bones of the body, in their capacity as the seat of the emotions (*OLD* s.v. *ossa* 1e). Some scholars have thought *dextrae . . . ossa* too striking to be right. According to Heinsius, Naugerius preferred *orsa* ('Naugerius *orsa* malit ex suis'). Burman followed:

> si ossa retinendum, intelligenda certe digitorum ossa & articuli, quibus calamum tenebat; sed an recte hoc dicatur dubito; & melius puto *orsa*

> *dextrae*, id est cogitata, nunc scribenda per dextram, quae modo inceperat chartae committere. . . .

So too Shuckburgh. I keep *ossa*. Naugerius' *orsa* is not impossible: Palmer objects that '*orsa* is never used by Ovid of epistolary writing'; but that does not preclude a single instance, especially since *orsa* is so used by other authors and occurs in Ovid [?] of spoken words, [Ovid] *Ep. Drus.* 210 *tristia cum medius rumperet orsa dolor*, of grief interrupting a speech. See *TLL* s.v. *ordior* 950.46. However, *ossa* should not have been doubted: by attributing the trembling bones to the *dextra* rather than to herself, Hypermestra again personifies her hand (see on 5 *manus*), and prepares for the even more striking personification that follows (see next n.).

19–20:
Lynceus might think Hypermestra's hand capable of committing murder, but it is not even capable of writing about it. As we later learn, when last Lynceus saw Hypermestra she was brandishing a sword against him (76); he may well have drawn his own conclusions—hence 19 *putes*. In this couplet, Hypermestra draws on all her rhetorical faculties in an attempt to persuade her husband that at no point did he have anything to fear from her (not quite true: see 45–6). *caede . . . fungi* is a gentle reminder to Lynceus that the murder which he suspects Hypermestra nearly carried out was at any rate not her own idea, but a duty imposed upon her (cf. Palmer *ad loc.*, Ehwald (1900) 13). Hypermestra's protestation of innocence turns on a chiasmus (*caede . . . fungi potuisse . . . scribere . . . caede*). *mariti* is carefully vague: Lynceus is left to fill in the detail, if he so wishes, that the *maritus* in question is himself. Jacobson misses the point:

> Remarkably striking is verse 19 which seems not to have troubled commentators, but, I think, should have, *quam tu caede putes fungi potuisse mariti*. Who is *tu*? Can this really be Lynceus? Why should he, of all people, be the one to think that Hypermestra could have committed an act of murder? Moreover, does not the third person *mariti* in the same line make it rather unlikely that *tu* is Lynceus? Perhaps, if the text is sound, *tu* is vaguely general. (I have little faith in this view. Might Ulitius' *ne* for *tu* be worth considering?) At any rate, I suspect that Lynceus is again in this verse but a third person.
>
> (Jacobson (1974) 128)

The masterstroke of Hypermestra's rhetoric is 19 *quam*. The hasty reader supplies *Hypermestra* as antecedent (so e.g. Shuckburgh, Palmer,

Showerman-Goold, Isbell); but at least as likely a candidate is *dextra*—far more likely, in fact, since Hypermestra has just referred to the *dextra* at 18, but has not mentioned herself in the first person since 9 *me* (on 12 *cadam* see n.). Hypermestra gives an explanation for the *tremor* that affected her *dextrae . . . ossa* in 18: 'The hand you think was capable of carrying out a husband's murder is frightened to write about a murder it did not perform.' The usurpation of Hypermestra's role by the *dextra* is to be viewed in the context of the wider motif (see on 5 *manus*). The personification of the hand in 19–20 is prepared for in 17–8: an ascending scale of personification begins with the inobtrusive *cor pavet*, passes through the striking *dextrae ossa* and on to our couplet. In 21, Hypermestra reverts to the first person: having ascribed the struggle to spare Lynceus to the hand, she nevertheless narrates the tale herself. Ovid has here built on the motif set out at 12.116–7:

> deficit hoc uno littera nostra loco:
> quod facere ausa mea est, non audet scribere dextra.

Medea's hand is unable to write of the murder of her brother. Hypermestra changes Medea's motif in order to make a persuasive rhetorical point: unlike Medea, she claims that the deed was not done, as the trembling hands prove.

19 potuisse:
Purposefully ambiguous. If Lynceus is to correctly identify the *maritus* as himself, and *quam* as Hypermestra's hand, he must recognize that *potuisse* = 'to have been capable of (but did not)', as at e.g. Propertius 2.6.5 *quae deletas potuit componere Thebas*, of Phryne whose offer to rebuild Thebes was refused. Alternatively, if Lynceus does not realize that the *caedes* referred to is his own brush with death, he will take *potuisse* simply as = 'had the heart to (and did).' Reminiscence of Horace's *impiae sponsos potuere duro/perdere ferro*, (*Carm.* 3.11.31–2 'The wicked girls had the heart to destroy their grooms with the hard sword', of all the Danaids except Hypermestra) will only serve to mislead him.

21:
Despite her painful memories, Hypermestra will nevertheless attempt to give an account of the wedding-night (*sed tamen experiar*). Jacobson finds Hypermestra's reluctant agreement to begin her narration jarring:

> For whose benefit is the narrative? Lynceus knows what has happened. This sort of unnecessary narrative of information is common in the *Heroides*, where the narratives are often for the benefit of the inner self; what strains matters here is the *sed tamen experiar*, as if someone wants here to recount the events and she consciously agrees.
>
> (Jacobson (1974) 129–30)

In fact, *sed tamen experiar* is wholly natural. Hypermestra's narrative is for Lynceus' benefit: the bulk of it, in which Hypermestra confesses that she attempted to kill him (33–70), is unknown to Lynceus, since he was asleep at the time. And Lynceus has indeed requested that she recount these events (77 *quaerenti causam*).

Reluctance to narrate past horrors or sorrows, which is nevertheless overcome for the sake of the addressee or audience, is a rhetorical *topos* (cf. Ehwald (1900) 13), and goes back to the *Odyssey* (Homer *Od.* 7.207ff., 9.1ff.). The model in Latin verse is Virgil *Aen.* 2.3ff., *infandum, regina, iubes renovare dolorem* etc., which culminates in:

> sed si tantus amor casus cognoscere nostros
> et breviter Troiae supremum audire laborem,
> quamquam animus meminisse horret luctuque refugit,
> incipiam. fracti bello fatisque repulsi etc.
>
> (Virgil *Aen.* 2.10–3)

The sense-pause at a caesura that allows the narrative to begin mid-line (13) is striking:

> The pause here is magnificent.... The whole passage is a fine illustration of Virgil's method of composing in paragraph units, with the rhythm coming naturally to rest when the thought is complete....
>
> (R.G. Austin (1964) on Virgil loc. cit.)

Ovid employs this same device to the same purpose—that is, to begin a narrative mid-line following a disclaimer—on more than one occasion: cf. e.g. 8.75ff., 20.109ff., *Met.* 14.464ff. Since Virgil *Aen.* 2.10–3 seems to have been famous in antiquity (see e.g. Austin on 2.13), and since, in the *Heroides* at any rate, Ovid employs strong mid-line pauses sparingly, it seems likely that the practice in Ovid draws on Virgil; in particular, *Met.* 14.464–6 may allude directly to *Aen.* 2.3ff.—see F. Bömer (1969–1986) on the former. In our line and at 8.75–6, Ovid has added a characteristic touch: the sense-pause comes in the middle of a rush of dactyls. Ovid appears to have found the combination of mid-line pause with dactylic run rhetorically effective; in the *Heroides*, it accompanies empassioned outbursts

and rhetorical climaxes: the dactylic couplet 13.83–4, with sense pause in 83, describes Laodamia's agitated confession; at 13.133–4 the same effect accompanies Laodamia's expression of alarm at having perpetrated an ill-omen, and her hurried attempt to revoke it; at 14.67–8, mid-line pause, dactyls, and a brief foray into historic present tenses describe the vivid scene of Hypermestra's tears falling onto the sleeping Lynceus; and at 14.105–6 the second of two empassioned apostrophes by Hypermestra to her ancestor Io receives the same treatment. Other notable instances in the *Heroides* are Dido's frantic request at 7.41, and Ariadne's panic at 10.11–2. In our passage, the staccato 21 introduces a swift-moving and vivid account (esp. 23–32), in which an abundance of short sentences and present-tenses produces a sense of immediacy. The urgent tone of the wedding-night narrative, apparent from its dactylic outset, is in amusing tension with the professed reluctance of the narrator; and *sed tamen experiar* ('but I'll try, even so') sounds a note of bathos after the dread expressed in 17–20—this is particularly apparent against the backdrop of its Virgilian counterpart, *sed si tantus amor . . . incipiam.* Ovid is playing with the 'reluctant narrator' motif.

Jacobson considers that Hypermestra's prefatory remark expressing reluctance is only the first of several correspondances between the wedding-night narrative and *Aen.* 2:

> I suspect that Ovid has modelled his entire account of the wedding-night on Vergil's account of another night of horror, the fall of Troy. . . .
> (Jacobson (1974) 138)

This seems unlikely: the 'correspondances' are vague, or involve common expressions: for instance, *Pelasgus*, which Jacobson notes occurs both in verse 23 of our epistle and at *Aen.* 2.83, is found, in nominal or adjectival form, seven times in Virgil and nineteen times in Ovid; similarly, although 2.82 is the sole occurrence of *Belides* in Virgil, *Her.* 14.73 is one of seven such instances in Ovid. Common subject-matter (in this case, narration of a night of horror) inevitably produces some coincidence of motifs.[3]

[3] Cf. D.A. West – A.J. Woodman (1979) 195, 'Similarities of word or thought or phrase can occur because writers . . . are describing similar or conventional situations'; for an argument against such an approach, see S. Hinds (1998) 18ff. on 'philological fundamentalism'.

21–2 modo facta . . . erat:
The accomplished scene-setting for the narration belies Hypermestra's claim that this is a reluctant attempt. The description of evening in the epic style sets not only the time of day but also the mood. Cf. e.g. Jupiter's arrival at the house of Lycaon:

> Arcadis hinc sedes et inhospita tecta tyranni
> ingredior, traherent cum sera crepuscula noctem.
>
> (*Met.* 1.218–9).

Those lines set the tone for Lycaon's wickedness, and Jupiter's subsequent decision to punish him. In our couplet, the pentameter 22 gives an epic periphrasis on *crepuscula*, 'dusk' (cf. e.g. the periphrases on *luce* and *nocte* at 13.101). 'Ancient poets indulged in innumerable periphrases for dawn and dusk' (Kenney on 18.111); Ovid's choice here is carefully made:

> . . . 21–2 . . . not only sets a tone of gloom with its stress on darkness, but it also proves a very precise metaphor, thanks to the common association of *lux* with life and *nox* with death (in this poem, see 74): this was the end of their lives, the beginning of their doom.
>
> (Jacobson (1974) 136).

22 ultima pars lucis primaque noctis erat:
crepuscula (21) is thus identified as evening rather than morning twilight. That P should have been among the several mss. that transpose *lucis* and *noctis*, giving the erroneous *ultima pars noctis primaque lucis erat*, is mildly surprising. Rather more startling is Heinsius' attempt to defend that reading, by asserting nothing more than *crepuscula* can = 'dawn', and that the wedding banquet, already over when Hypermestra begins her narrative, is to be imagined as having gone on into the early hours. As Palmer notes, 71 and 78 demand that our line refer to dusk, not dawn: much is yet to happen in Hypermestra's account before it reaches the *nox atra* (78) that precedes sunrise (71 *lucemque timebam*).

23–4:
In accordance with the marriage custom, Hypermestra and her sisters are welcomed and entertained by the grooms' family. They are led in the marriage procession (*ducimur*: *TLL* s.v. *duco* 2142.51ff.), to be greeted by Aegyptus (24 *socer*). As Aegyptus is a foreigner in Argos and has no home there, he uses as venue for the wedding the palace

of Pelasgus (23 *magni . . . Pelasgi*), the distant Argive ancestor of Danaus and Aegyptus (W.H. Röscher (1884–1937) s.v. *Pelasgus* 8). *Inachides* and *Pelasgi* evoke two early forbears; *magni* suggests the awe with which the *Inachides* (cf. 105n.) enter the palace of their long-dead relative.

The couplet has caused some consternation among scholars, since all have wrongly assumed that Ovid's *magnus Pelasgus* is a king of Argos contemporary to the events of the epistle. The assumption is made because a contemporary Pelasgus does indeed feature in the mythological tradition: King Pelasgus is a character in Aeschylus' *Supplices* (named at *Supp.* 251 and 1010), and is mentioned by the scholia on Euripides (*Or.* 857, 932, 1248, and *Phoen.* 106).

Some scholars have thought that our couplet follows Aeschylus' version. Such a view is problematic. The details of the wedding would have been contained in the second two plays of the trilogy, the *Aegyptii* and *Danaides*, neither of which survive; but that which can be discerned from the extant *Supplices* is difficult to reconcile with Ovid's account. In Ovid, Aegyptus is present for the marriage; he is absent from Aeschylus' *Supplices*, not having accompanied his sons to Argos. That he arrived at some point in the *Aegyptii*, before the marriage took place, is possible but unlikely: in other versions of the myth he arrives either with his sons, or else after the murders (so Phrynicus, according to the scholiast on Euripides *Or.* 872). Cf. Winnington-Ingram (1961) 148, Garvie (1969) 209, and Johansen-Whittle (1980) 1.50 on the unlikelihood of Aegyptus featuring in Aeschylus' trilogy. In Ovid, Aegyptus appears to have control of the palace of Pelasgus; at the end of the *Supplices*, Aeschylus' Pelasgus has taken Danaus and his daughters under his protection. As they stand, these two versions seem irreconcilable. See Garvie (1969) 169:

> . . . Ovid seems from lines 23–4 to be following an account that has Aegyptus already installed in the palace at Argos. It is difficult to reconcile this with Aeschylus' version so far as it is given in the *Supplices* at least; for there it is the Danaids who are entertained by Pelasgus.

Scholars have attempted to obviate this difficulty. C.G. Haupt (1829) tries to remove Pelasgus from both the Aeschylus and the Ovid: he prefers the paradosis Πελασγοῦ to Canter's conjecture Πελασγός at Aeschylus *Supp.* 251; conjectures ὁ Πελασγός ('the Pelasgian') at 1010; and in our couplet prefers the variant *tyranni* to *Pelasgi*. Others try to remove Aegyptus from the Ovid: thus J.G.J. Hermann (1827–39) vol. 2 323f. takes 24 *socer* as referring to Pelasgus, who in Aegyptus'

absence has assumed this rôle ('And, acting as a father-in-law, Pelasgus himself welcomes the armed daughters-in-law'); Birt (1877) 397ff. goes one step further, conjecturing *nec* for *et* in 24: 'And the father-in-law (i.e. Aegyptus) did not personally welcome his armed daughters-in-law (sc. but rather Pelasgus welcomed them).' Palmer attempts to explain the difficulty away: Ovid's Aegyptus welcomes the Danaids into the palace of the contemporary King Pelasgus either because the king has relinquished his authority to Danaus (and, presumably, Danaus allows Aegytpus to occupy the palace for the purposes of the ceremony); or because Pelasgus has lent his palace to the brothers as a venue for the wedding.

Garvie (1969) 169 rightly notes that Ovid is not drawing on Aeschylus in our line. It seems likely that in Aeschylus' trilogy Aegyptus did not come to Argos; that Pelasgus died during the course of the *Aegyptii*, and Danaus took control of his kingdom and his palace; and that Danaus welcomed the sons of Aegyptus into the palace as his guests. See Winnington-Ingram (1961) 146, and cf. Johansen-Whittle (1980) 1.43. This scenario has important consequences for Aeschylus' plot: '. . . the murder of the sons of Aegyptus is the murder of guests under his own roof' (Winnington-Ingram loc. cit.). Ovid's scenario as given in our couplet is quite different; and yet even Garvie seems to think that Ovid's Pelasgus must be a contemporary king (p. 169).

Ovid here forcibly departs from Aeschylus' version. He sets the wedding in the palace of Pelasgus—but this Pelasgus, unlike Aeschylus', is long dead. Ovid's *magni . . . Pelasgi* is both reminiscent of, and a departure from, Aeschylus' Pelasgus. Ovid is not being unreasonably subversive: Aeschylus' King Pelasgus himself seems to have represented a departure from the tradition: elsewhere, the king of Argos at the time the Danaids arrive there is called Gelanor (Pseudo-Apollodorus *Bib.* 2.1.4, Pausanias 2.16.1) or Hellanor (Eustathius on Homer *Il.* 1.42). Ovid has also set out to differ from Aeschylus on the question of Aegyptus. Ancient authors seem to have interested themselves in whether or not Aegyptus came to Argos (cf. Bonner (1902) 135), and to have been keen to represent their opinion on the matter as that of the majority: thus, according to the scholiast on Euripides *Or.* 872, the Aegyptiads are generally reckoned to have come to Argos alone, whereas, according to Euripides fr. 846 Nauck (part of a prologue; to which play is uncertain), Aegyptus is generally reckoned to have come to Argos with his sons. Ovid comes down unequivocally against Aeschylus, and thus affords his version maximum

dramatic impact: Aegyptus, present in the Ovid where he was absent in the Aeschylus, unknowingly greets his murderous daughters-in-law. 24, laden with dramatic irony, has met with approval:

> A whole story is comprehended in one word *armatas* (24), and the impending horror is embodied in the juxtaposition of *armatas* and *accipit*.
> (Jacobson (1974) 136)

Cf. Ehwald (1900) 14. *ipse* points out the irony; but it also declares that, in making Aegyptus present at the wedding, Ovid is making a stand against a strong branch of the mythological tradition.

After 24, Aegyptus is barely mentioned again. We do not learn his fate. It is unlikely that this particular loose-end would have concerned Ovid. At any rate, other authors seem to have been for the most part unconcerned: of those who mention Aegyptus at Argos, only one mentions what became of him after the death of his sons:

> ἐν δὲ τῶι ἑτέρωι πεποίηται μνῆμα Αἰγύπτου τοῦ Βήλου. φυγεῖν δὲ ἐς τὴν Ἀρόην οἱ Πατρεῖς φασιν αὐτὸν τοῖς τε ἐς τοὺς παῖδας παθήμασι καὶ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτὸ πεφρικότα τοῦ Ἄργους καὶ ἐς πλέον τοῦ Δαναοῦ δείματι.
> (Pausanias 7.21.13)

25–8:

Hypermestra recreates for her reader her impressions of the banqueting hall. She focuses on specific details of the ceremony, seen (25–6, the wedding torches and the offerings at the altar) and heard (27–8, the ritual marriage-cry). But these staple elements of wedding ritual (cf. e.g. *Her.* 12.139–40) are undercut by the ominous significance that Hypermestra reads into them (26 *invitos*, 27–8 *fugit ille vocantes;/ipsa Iovis coniunx cessit ab urbe sua*). It is possible that earlier treatments of the myth took similar advantage of the dramatic irony inherent in the Danaids' wedding ceremony. In Aeschylus' trilogy, the wedding night, and probably also the wedding, will not have been represented on stage, but they are likely to have been imagined as taking place between the second and the third play (Winnington-Ingram (1961) 146, however, thinks that no formal ceremony, staged or unstaged, was required in Aeschylus' version). The second play (*Aegyptii*) may well have contained ironic hints at future horrors as wedding preparations were made. See Johansen-Whittle (1980) 1.51:

> The play [*Aegyptii*] will have ended with preparations for the marriage, offering rich opportunities for tragic irony.

and Garvie pp. 196–7:

> It is argued further that the preparation of the murder plot would be impossible in the presence of a chorus composed of the victims. It would perhaps be difficult, but not impossible if effective use were made of hints and double meanings, perfectly clear to the audience, but meaningless to the sons of Aegyptus. The tragic chorus can be notoriously slow to understand.

Ovid may even have drawn on Aeschylus for Hypermestra's ironies. The marriage-torches are described in terms of bright opulence: the reader is left to decide for himself exactly what is meant by *prae-cinctae . . . auro*—Palmer's guess that 'these torches were probably bound round in the lower portion with gilden bands' seems as good as any—while Ovid indulges in a favourite word (see Bömer (1969–1986) on *Met.* 14.395 *praecingitur*), perhaps expecting these torches to be familiar to his readers from an earlier version of the myth. *conlucent* may refer equally to the brightness of the flame (*Met.* 4.402–3 *pinguesque ardere videntur/ lampades et rutilis conlucere ignibus aedes*) and to the splendour of the gold (Catullus 64.45 *collucent pocula mensae*). That Ovid does not dwell on the ironically positive associations of the torches' brightness (which were noted e.g. by Jacobson (1974) 136, 'The irony of *conlucent* (25) is calculated') supports the idea of readership familiarity. Ovid's choice of word for 'torches', the Greek *lampades*, perhaps indicates that he has a Greek predecessor in mind: although *lampas* does occur elsewhere in Ovid, it is not his usual word for torches (F. Bessone (1997) on *Her.* 12.140 [138 her numbering], 'Prevalentemente poetico, il grecismo *lampas* è in Ov. più raro di *taeda*, a sua volta meno frequente di *fax*'; cf. Bömer (1969–1986) on *Met.* 4.403).

27–8:

The marriage deities depart—a common element of the 'inauspicious wedding' motif, for which see e.g. Jacobson (1974) 392–3 and cf. 11.103–6n.; in particular, Ovid may have had in mind the *topos* 'the bride who dies on her wedding day', on which see e.g. Kenney (1990) on Apuleius *Met.* 4.33.4—in this case, however, it is the grooms who will perish. The hexameter describes the departure of the wedding-god Hymenaeus. This poetic cliché is often reworked by Ovid to differing effect: note e.g. the sustained description at 21.157ff., and the plea for the god to reverse his usual duties at 11.103–4. In our line, the point is simple and succinct: the god flees from those

who are calling on him to be present (*ades* is sometimes added to the ritual cry: see 11.103–4n.). 'The multitude invokes Hymen, but Hymen knows better' (Jacobson (1974) 393). Anaphora of *vocare*, juxtaposition with asyndeton of *vocat* and *fugit*, and the rush of dactyls with mid-line pause, all contribute to the picture. The other absentee, treated in the pentameter, is Juno, so eager to be absent that she has already left (*cessit*). Her presence at this marriage might have been expected on two counts. The first is implicit: as wife of Jupiter (*Iovis coniunx*), Juno assumes at weddings the role of divine matron of honour (*pronuba*); see e.g. Roscher (1884–1937) s.v. Iuno 588.40ff. She is often absent from ominous weddings, like that of Procne to Tereus at *Met.* 6.428, from which Hymenaeus and the Graces are also absent, or that of Ianthe to the as yet female Iphis, at which the presence of both Juno and Hymenaeus is questioned (*Met.* 9.762–3). Alternatively, *pronuba Iuno* may lend a sinister presence, as, famously, at *Aen.* 4.166. The second reason is made explicit: in fleeing this unholy marriage, Juno has departed *ab urbe sua*—that is, from Argos, a city with which she has a well-established affiliation (Homer *Il.* 4.8, 50–2, 5.908; see further Roscher s.v. *Hera* 2075.28ff.). The abandoning of a city by its gods freqeuntly foretells disaster for that city: see e.g. Tacitus *Hist.* 5.13 for such a departure from the besieged Jerusalem. That Juno is willing not only to forgo her role as *pronuba*, but even to abandon a city close to her heart, is evidence of her great disgust at the impending massacre. This divine disgust may be seen as an expression of Hypermestra's own ('projection').

27 vulgus . . . vocat:
vulgus is among those nouns that may take either a singular or a plural verb. See H-S 436. In any given instance, the number of a verb that has such a noun as its subject cannot be determined with any great degree of certainty, since mss. are unreliable for such details, and frequently disagree amongst themselves: so here a small number of mss., including two of Dörrie's 'antiquissimi libri', give *vocat; vocant* is given by the rest—including P, despite the reports of some editors to the contrary (e.g. Merkel, Giomini. My photograph copy shows a supralineal stroke over the *a*: see Lindsay (1915) 346ff.) It is therefore practically impossible to trace specific patterns of usage. Metre, however, can reveal the broad outlines: Ovid uses *vulgus* with a singular verb at *Ars* 2.536, 3.46, *Fast.* 1.643–4, *Met.* 1.220–1, 6.401–2, 11.640–1, 14.412, *Trist.* 1.9.13, 4.6.47, and with the plural

at *Ars* 1.268 and *Met.* 12.53; in each instance, metre will not allow the other number. Given, then, that both numbers with *vulgus* are paralleled in Ovid, common sense might favour *vocant* in our line, since the verb is immediately picked up by the plural participle *vocantes*; moreover, the jingle *vocant* . . . *vocantes* pleasingly links the two sentences. On the other hand, the two metrically-secure Ovidian instances of *vulgus* with plural verb might be thought of as special cases: at *Ars* 1.268, *vulgus* is a vocative, the plural verb an imperative; and at *Met.* 12.53 the editors show by their punctuation—*veniunt, leve vulgus, euntque*—that they take *vulgus* not as the subject of the plural verbs, but in apposition to a generalized plural subject. Moreover, there is a probable Ovidian instance of *vulgus* with singular verb, immediately picked up by a third person plural verb, *Met.* 5.41–2 *tum vero indomitas ardescit vulgus in iras/telaque coniciunt* (admittedly not metrically secure: the paradosis *ardescit* might be a corruption of *ardescunt*. At *Met.* 6.401–2 *talibus extemplo redit ad praesentia dictis/vulgus et extinctum cum stirpe Amphiona luget*, one late ms. gives *lugent*). This would offer some support for *vocat* . . . *vocantes*. There is, then, sufficient reason to challenge the usually accepted reading *vocant*, and to print *vocat*.

'Hymen Hymenaee':

The wedding-cry, on which see e.g. C.J. Fordyce (1961) 238 on Catullus 61, occurs on only two other occasions in Ovid: at *Her.* 12.145, and in the shortened form *Hymenaee* at *Ars* 1.563. The chant in direct speech is highly suited to Hypermestra's vivid narrative; but Ovid may also have had a mischieviously aetiological reason for including it. Hyginus records that the wedding-cry had its origin in the singing competitions organised by Danaus for his daughters at their wedding:

> quinto loco Argis quos [the antecedent, probably 'ludos', is missing] fecit Danaus Beli filius filiarum nuptiis cantu, unde hymenaeus dictus.
> (Hyginus *Fab.* 273.1)

It is perhaps not fanciful to suppose that Ovid, familiar with that story, delights in putting the wedding-cry in the mouth of one of its originators.

29–30:

The grooms arrive. Hypermestra characterizes them as revellers. They wear the garlands and hair-unguents characteristic of ancient

party-goers (30): for *madidas* without defining ablative in the sense 'anointed with perfume', see McKeown (1989) on *Am.* 1.6.38. They are accompanied by their rowdy companions, 29 *comitum clamore frequentes*: *frequens* = 'abounding in' + ablative is not uncommon (*OLD* s.v. *frequens* 2, *TLL* q.v. 1299.11ff.) and, although it is usually used of places (*Her.* 16.53–4 *locus . . . ilicibus . . . frequens, Met.* 4.620 *infesta . . . terra colubris*, 8.329 *silva frequens trabibus*, 9.106 *verticibus . . . frequens . . . amnis*, 15.715 *niveis . . . frequens Sinuessa colubris*), it can be applied to crowds (*Ars* 1.147 *pompa frequens caelestibus . . . eburnis*) and even to an individual (Plautus *Mil.* 662 [*ego*] *benefactis frequens*); nevertheless, in our line Ovid stretches the usage to its limits: *TLL* 6.1299.17 adds an explanatory paraphrase, '*comitibus clamantibus stipati*'; Shuckburgh's is '*clamoribus comitum frequentium celebrati*'. Finally, like all good revellers, the grooms are drunk—not, though, simply *ebrius*, but *mero dubii*, a delightful phrase, perhaps modelled on a Greek word, such as μεθυσφαλής, found in the Greek Anthology, of a personified cup at 6.248.1, and of Heracles' drunken footsteps at 16.99.3; with the latter, compare the only other instance of *dubius* with reference to drunkenness, *Fast.* 6.678 *dubii stantque labantque pedes.* In our line, *dubius* refers not to the feet of the revellers, but to the revellers themselves, and hence depicts their whole alcohol-affected demeanour.

This scene of happy revellers is poignant, being at odds with the grooms' impending doom (an idea developed in 31–2—see n.); in particular, *dubii* may hint at vague forboding on the part of the grooms. Yet the description of the victims does not seem wholly sympathetic. The periphrases for 'drunk' and 'with noisy companions' discussed above may have something of the tone of euphemisms, distancing the narrator from unseemly activity. Finally, and perhaps most interestingly, the grooms seem to have gone beyond acceptable celebratory behaviour. They appear to be late. See Treggiari (1991) 166 on the usual practice:

> Though we hear little of [the bridegroom's] part in the proceedings, it is clear that he went ahead of the bride's procession and, since it would be a melancholy business to sing solo, he too must have been accompanied by a noisy crowd of friends and attendants. He needed to be at his house in time to receive his wife.

Interestingly, Hypermestra does not distinguish Lynceus from his brothers at this point.

31–2:

The happiness of the grooms is played off against their imminent deaths. The pathetic irony turns on the interplay between marital and funereal motifs (see R. Rehm (1994), and cf. 11.103–6n.), and in particular on the equation of the marriage-chamber with the tomb (the most famous instance of which is Sophocles *Antigone* 891 ὦ τύμβος, ὦ νυμφεῖον) and on that of the *lectus genialis*, the wedding-couch, with the death-bed, *lectus vitalis* (Rehm (1994) 29, 44, 77; Seaford (1990) 78). The motifs are succinctly phrased; each word contributes to the pathetic effect. *laeti* (31) is so laden with irony that it gives rise to *thalamos sua busta*, an exclamatory parenthesis. *feruntur* is well-chosen, as it suits both the joyful and the ominous tone of the scene. On the one hand, it suggests the grooms' eagerness: see Palmer *ad loc.* '. . . they came rushing in', and Lewis-Short s.v. *fero* 'with *se* or mid. (so esp. freq.), to move or go swiftly, to haste, speed, betake one's self'; in addition, there may be a humorous echo of the custom whereby the bride is carried over the threshold (see e.g. Plutarch *Rom.* 15.6., *Quaestiones Romanae* 29). On the other hand, *feruntur* has funereal overtones (Jacobson (1974) 136). The pentameter 32 contains similar tensions. *corporibus . . . premunt* captures the grooms' sexual excitement: *stratum/torum premere* frequently has obvious erotic associations (explicit at e.g. 10.55–6, *Am.* 3.14.32, *Ars* 2.712, 3.779, *Fast.* 2.795), but the phrase here, like *feruntur* above, hints at a funeral. Cf. [Ovid] *Ep. Drus.* 315–6 *frigidus ille tibi corpusque refertur inane,/quemque premat sine te sternitur ecce torus*, where *corpus, (re)ferre*, and *torum premere* form, as in our line, the basis of a play on erotic and funereal motifs. The funereal undertones in 32 *corporibus . . . premunt* are made explicit in *funere digna*, 'fit for death', 'fit for the funeral', or perhaps even 'for a corpse', although the singular *funere* after the plural *corporibus* is somewhat strained in this last sense. Some scholars have found this striking phrase problematic. Palmer's paraphrase 'digniora cadaveribus premi' is inaccurate. Hypermestra's point is not that the marriage-couches would have been better used as death-beds, as e.g. the torches at the doomed wedding of Hypsipyle to Jason would have been better used as funeral torches, *faxque sub arsuros dignior ire rogos* (6.42); rather, *funere digna* (not *dignior*) refers to the fact that these couches will actually be used as death-beds, and are appropriate for such a use because of the literary commonplace that connects marriage-couches and death-beds. Burman's conjecture *strataque funeribus corpore dicta premunt*, which he paraphrases 'premunt corpore strata quae dicta

et destinata erant eorum funeribus', makes the point in an intolerably prosaic manner; Damsté's *tempore digna*, '(sc. *nuptiarum*)' (P.H. Damsté (1905) 42), is hopelessly banal; and Hall's *nequaquam funere digna* (J.B. Hall (1990) 282) misses the point: because of verbal correspondences and similarities of motif between weddings and deaths, a wedding-night murder is, not inappropriate, but ironically apposite.

As the grooms enter the marriage-chambers, they remain undesignated by any noun: *feruntur* and *premunt* have no expressed subject (cf. 11.81–94n.). *laeti iuvenes* and *laeti fratres*, variants for *laeti—thalamos* in 31, were almost certainly scribal glosses that entered the text, perhaps after the second *thalamos* had fallen out (two mss. omit this *thalamos*, one leaving a blank space). 'It is, I think, the horror of the event that prevents [Hypermestra] from naming the victims' (Jacobson (1974) 137); more likely, she is so immersed in her own vivid narrative that she sees the protagonists right before her eyes (29 *ecce*) and hence feels no need to identify them. Or perhaps the omission of a noun conveys some distaste for the rowdy grooms (cf. 29–30n. 32 *strata . . . premunt*, despite being used of unsympathetic characters at e.g. *Am.* 1.4.15 *premet . . . torum*, is, according to McKeown (1989) there, 'not intrinsically pejorative'). This last interpretation gains some credibility if we read *viri* at 33 (33n. *viri*): they are termed *viri* once their rowdiness has ceased.

32 digna:

That the word *dignus* occurs three times in the epistle (cf. 99 of Io, 124 of Lynceus) might be significant: Horace's Hypermestra was *face nuptiali/digna* (*Carm.* 3.11.33–4).

33–4:

Hypermestra's description of tranquil Argos alludes to another account of ironically peaceful sleep:

> tum me confectum curis somnoque gravatum
> infelix habuit thalamus, pressitque iacentem
> dulcis et alta quies placidaeque simillima morti.
>
> (Virgil *Aen.* 6.520–2)

Note the verbal correspondences with our passage: 520 *tum*, 33 *iam*; 520 *somno . . . gravatum*, 33 *graves . . . somno*; 521 *thalamus*, 31 *thalamos*; 521 *pressit*, 32 *premunt*; 521 *iacentem*, 33 *iacebant*; 522 *alta quies*, 34 *quies alta*. Close similarity of context—Deiphobus asleep in his bedroom

is about to be murdered, with his wife Helen as accomplice; the sons of Aegyptus, asleep in their bedroom, are about to be murdered by their wives, who are under orders—tells against mere coincidence. So too does the number of correspondences in a small space of lines, and the relative rareness of the phrases used: this is the first Ovidian occurrence of *somno gravis*, and he uses it again only at *Met.* 1.224 and 3.608; *alta quies* occurs in Ovid only here and at *Met.* 7.186. By alluding to the moments before Deiphobus' murder, Ovid reinforces the impression of impending doom. As often, Ovid introduces variation from his model: *infelix . . . thalamus* becomes *thalamos . . .*—*thalamos sua busta*; sleep presses down (*pressit*) on Deiphobus, whereas in Ovid it is the grooms themselves that press down (*premunt*); *gravatus* becomes *gravis*, a word Ovid prefers; the description of sleep as *placidae . . . simillima morti*, itself an allusion to Homer *Od.* 13.80 θανάτῳ ἄγχιστα ἐοικώς, is not picked up by Ovid, who instead introduces *securum* to perform an equally ironic function. The change from 'careworn' to 'drunk', that is, from *confectum curis somnoque gravatum* to *vinoque gravis somnoque* (on *cibo*, see n. below), although appropriate to context, is particularly intriguing: in an account of Deiphobus' murder that may bear close relation to, or even itself be, a version familiar to Virgil (see e.g. W.F. Jackson Knight (1932) and F.A. Paley (1876)), Deiphobus is described as 'heavy with wine', καρηβαρέοντα (Quintus Smyrnaeus 13.355). As E. Norden (1926) notes, Virgil 'cleaned up' this description ('Die vulgäre Tradition steht bei Quintus 13.354ff. . . . Das war für V. nicht zu gebrauchen'). Ovid, either by coincidence or mischievous design, harks back to the original description.

33 iamque:
iam, which moves the narrative on to a point when the grooms are asleep, is, in view of the mythological tradition, highly tantalizing. There is considerable disagreement in the sources over whether or not Hypermestra and/or her sisters had sex with their grooms on the wedding-night. The scholiast on Euripides *Hec.* 886 records that Hypermestra was the only Danaid to have sex with her husband:

> συνεβούλευσε ταῖς θυγατράσιν ὁ Δαναὸς ὥστε ἀνελεῖν νύκτωρ τοὺς ἑαυτῶν ἄνδρας πρὸ τῆς μίξεως τῆς πρὸς αὐτὰς θάνατον ἐπαπειλήσας ταῖς μὴ τοῦτο ποιούσαις. αἱ μὲν οὖν πᾶσαι ἔχουσαι τὰ τοῦ πατρὸς προστάγματα ἀνεῖλον τοὺς ἄνδρας, μία δὲ μόνη τούτων ἡ Ὑπερμήστρα ἐφείσατο τοῦ Λυγκέως, ἀπὸ τῆς μίξεως διάθεσιν ἐσχηκυῖα πρὸς αὐτόν.

Prometheus tells Io at Aeschylus *Prom.* 859 that the grooms will have no opportunity to take pleasure with their brides, φθόνον δὲ σωμάτων ἕξει θεός; by contrast, Pseudo-Apollodorus *Bib.* 2.1.5, the scholiast on Pindar *N.* 10.6, and Euripides *Archelaus* fr. 2 Austin (all quoted under 4n.) state that Lynceus 'spared Hypermestra's virginity', with the implication that Lynceus' brothers were not so sparing. Eustathius' comment (on *Il.* 1.42) that the Danaids slaughtered their grooms while in a marital embrace (καὶ ὡς αἱ Δαναΐδες πᾶσαι πάντας τοὺς ἐκείνου κατέσφαξαν ἀφυλάκτως ὡς ἐν γάμῳ νυμφίους συσχοῦσαι δίχα μιᾶς ἢ δύο τινῶν) implies at least some amatory activity. With *iam*, Ovid's Hypermestra coyly sidesteps the issue; and Ovid refuses to engage with the tangled mythical tradition (cf. 4n., on Ovid's treatment of Hypermestra's motives in sparing Lynceus).

viri:
The accepted reading *cibo* may be an intrusion. No previous mention has been made of food, whereas *vino* picks up *mero* in 29. *cibo gravis* is found (e.g. Livy 31.41.11), but not in Ovid; *vino gravis*, however, occurs at *Met.* 10.438, *somno gravis* at *Met.* 1.224, and *mero somnoque gravis* at *Met.* 3.608. The combination of *vinum* and *somnus* in such phrases goes back to Ennius *Ann.* 8 fr. 14 Skutsch (see Austin (1964) on Virgil *Aen.* 2.265). For *cibo* I conjecture *viri*. The nameless rabble of 29–32, now peaceful, are finally designated by a noun. *viri* would easily have been lost before *vino; cibo*, a ready complement for *vino* and *somno*, was invented to fill the lacuna.

34 Argos:
A Greek neuter accusative. The name in Latin, when in the nominative or accusative case, occurs in both neuter singular and masculine plural forms; in the other cases, only the plural form is found. In the nominative and accusative, Ovid uses only the neuter singular form (*Rem.* 166, *Fast.* 6.47, *Met.* 2.240, 6.414. In each instance except the last the plural form would not scan). The oblique cases of the plural form are found in Ovid at *Fast.* 5.651, *Met.* 14.476 (so some edd.; others prefer *agris*), 15.164. Argos is the scene of the murder in most versions of the myth; Bonner (1902) 131–2 notes an exception (Schol. on Homer *Iliad* 1.42), in which the murder takes place in Egypt.

35–6:
Ovid uses Hypermestra's perspective to reduce the infamous murder of the grooms to nothing more than a few indistinct groans from

the neighbouring bedrooms. Hypermestra is reluctant even to state that the brothers were being murdered; instead, we find the euphemistic *quodque verebar.*

audire videbar/et tamen audibam:
The mannerism *audire videbar* (cf. e.g. Horace *Carm.* 3.4.6, and 2.1.21 *audire . . . videor* where, however, some editors prefer the conjecture *videre . . . videor*) is scrutinized and corrected by Hypermestra in the pentameter. '*tamen* is used because *videbar,* I seemed to hear, apparently expresses the groundlessness of his [sic] fancy' (Palmer). For a similar modification with *et tamen,* cf. Plautus *Poen.* 889 *male credam et credam tamen.*

36 audibam:
On *-ībam, -ības,* etc., a metrically convenient form of the imperfect indicative for fourth conjugation verbs, see M. Leumann (1963) 327, and Bömer (1969–1986) on *Fast.* 3.507 *audibat* who cites as Ovidian instances *Fast.* 4.795 *feribant, Met.* 2.582 *molibar,* 6.21 *mollibat,* and 8.199 *mollibat.* This form, unfamiliar to the scribes, frequently generated variants, whether unmetrical errors (or glosses) like *custodiebant* for *custodibant* at Catullus 64.319, and *audiebant* for *audibant* at Catullus 84.8, or competent synonyms like *conabar* for *mollibar* at *Met.* 2.582. In our line the variants include *audieram,* conjectured by Bentley, and approved by Merkel, Bornecque, and by Palmer in his text (in his commentary he changed his mind). The imperfect *audibam* is stylistically preferable to the pluperfect *audieram* since, by matching *videbar* in tense, it makes the modification of *audire videbar* simply and instantaneously ('I seemed to be hearing, and in fact was hearing').

quodque verebar, erat:
'And what I feared was true, was reality'; for this use of *sum* see *OLD* q.v. 8. Heinsius took the phrase to mean 'I had reason to fear', but was forced to change *verebar* to the subjunctive *vererer* to produce that sense, by analogy with *Pont.* 1.1.23 *quod metuas non est.*

37–8:
In this description of Hypermestra's alarm, Ovid plays with the similarity between the effects of fear and of death. Pallor, cold, and mental black-out are regular in descriptions of both. In scenes of violent death, *gemitus morientum* (35) may precede these physical 'symptoms'; so e.g. at Virgil *Aen.* 11.633–5:

tum vero et gemitus morientum et sanguine in alto
armaque corporaque et permixti caede virorum
semianimes volvuntur equi, pugna aspera surgit.

At first sight, 37 might seem to describe the death of the grooms; and the vivid present tenses (*abit* and *relinquit*) certainly seem suited to that task. 38 *iacui*, past tense and, crucially, first person, destroys this misapprehension. After all, Hypermestra only heard the murders, and so is unable to give a physical description of them; what the reader mistook for such a description is in fact an account of Hypermestra's reaction to what she heard. A pun on *frigida* adds a further twist: because the loss of *calor* is described as affecting Hypermestra rather than the grooms, the heroine is left *frigida facta*—not something a bride would wish to be on her wedding-night, *in . . . novo . . . toro. OLD* s.v. *frigidus* 8d 'lacking in ardour or passion, cold, unresponsive'.

39–40:
Ovid had previously used these same two similes for the same purpose, at *Am.* 1.7.53–6, quoted under 11.77–8n. There as here, the effect of a gentle zephyr on plant-stalks, and that of a breeze on poplar leaves, are compared with a girl's fearful trembling.

Both images are suitable for this comparison. Of the poplar leaves simile, McKeown (1989) on *Am.* 1.7.53–4 notes additional points of contact between the leaves and the girl: the use of *comae* ('hair') for the leaves; the fact that poplar trees were once themselves wretched maidens, the sisters of Phaethon; and the paleness of both frightened girls and the underside of poplar leaves.

Of the other simile, I note that *gracilis* (*Her.* 39, *Am.* 55) is an appropriate epithet not only for plants, as McKeown remarks, but also for young women: for *gracilitas* as a sought-after trait in girls, see e.g. Terence *Eu.* 313–4 *quas* [sc. *virgines*] *matres student/ demissis umeris esse, vincto pectore, ut gracilae sient.* I therefore prefer *graciles* to the variant *fragiles* in our line, and Goold's *graciles* to Hollis' *fragiles* and the paradosis *steriles* at *Ars* 1.553, where the simile occurs again—although it is possible that Ovid avoided using the same adjective on each occasion. The to-and-fro motion of the plants (*Her.* 39 *vibrantur, Am.* 55 *vibratur*) in the gentle breeze (*leni Zephyro, Her.* 39 and *Am.* 55) suits the trembling girl; Heinsius reasonably suggests that Ovid adapted Homer's simile (*Il.* 2.147–8), where the violent effect of a westerly

gale on a field of corn is compared with the Argives' reaction to Agamemnon's speech:

> ὡς δ' ὅτε κινήσῃ Ζέφυρος βαθὺ λήιον ἐλθών,
> λάβρος ἐπαιγίζων, ἐπί τ' ἠμύει ἀσταχύεσσιν

In our passage, Ovid makes some minor changes to the similes as given at *Am.* 1.7. The third simile there, the effect of the south wind on the water's surface, is omitted here—although it is employed at *Her.* 11.77, just as a further simile at *Am.* 1.7.57–8, tears compared to melting snow, is employed at *Her.* 13.52 (see nn. on each; for further use made of *Am.* 1.7 in our epistle, see on 5 *manus*). The order in which the two similes are presented is reversed, while at the same time the allocation of the poplar simile to the pentameter, and of the other to the hexameter, is retained. *harundo* (*Am.* 55) has become *aristae* (*Her.* 39). The most significant change is the inclusion in our passage of *frigida* (40), an additional point of contact with the girl: although strictly it is the wind, not the leaves, that is *frigida*, the adjective picks up 38 *frigida facta*.

One further thing has changed: the context. In our passage, the similes are used to describe the reaction of a witness to mass-murder; at *Am.* 1.7 the similes were used to describe a mistress' reaction to her lover's angry outburst. The change in context, from trivial to tragic, is meant to be noticed.

39 leni:
The mss. divide between *ut leni Zephyro* and *utque levi Zephyro*. *lenis* and *levis* are both suitable epithets for winds in general (*TLL* s.v. *lenis* 1145.20ff., s.v. *levis* 1204.25ff.) and for the gentle Zephyr in particular. But *leni* is perhaps preferable here. *lenis* appears to be a word that frequently eluded scribes: see e.g. *Met.* 11.192 *leni nam motus ab austro*, where is found the unmetrical variant *levi . . . austro*; and *Her.* 19.72 *lenior aura*, variants *mollior* and *levior*, the latter unmetrical. The allusion to *Am.* 1.7.53–6 in our lines (see next n.) lends some limited support for *ut leni*: if *ut leni* there is correct, as seems likely (see McKeown (1989) *ad loc.*), *ut leni* here might strengthen the allusion.

41 aut sic aut etiam tremui magis:
Hypermestra's concern to convey the exact extent of her trembling causes her to bungle her conclusion to the two similes. The weighing-up

of alternative possibilities may add a note of realism when the narrator cannot be expected to know the facts for certain: see e.g. *Her.* 2.146 *aut hoc aut simili carmine notus eris*, with Knox *ad loc.*, 'a realistic touch that catches the reader off guard: Phyllis does not expect to be able to dictate the text of the epitaph . . . on her tomb.' When, however, the narrator is omniscient, such weighing-up produces a distancing effect: see e.g. *Met.* 11.478–9 *aut minus aut certe medium non amplius aequor/puppe secabatur*, with J.B. Solodow (1998) 65ff. Applied to similes, this weighing-up introduces a note of artificial pedantry which upsets the commentators; it represents an extension of the 'negative simile', where the simile is outstripped by the reality (e.g. *Her.* 5.47–8 *non sic appositis vincitur vitibus ulmus,/ut tua sunt collo bracchia nexa meo*)—a common device in Roman epic poetry (see A.S. Hollis (1990) on Callimachus *Hec.* fr. 69, and Austin (1964) on Virgil *Aen.* 2.496). Which trembled more, wonders Hypermestra—myself, or the corn and poplar leaves in my similes? Cf. *Ars* 3.185–7 *quot nova terra parit flores, cum vere tepenti/vitis agit gemmas pigraque fugit hiems,/lana tot aut plures sucos bibit*; Horace *Carm.* 4.14.20–1 *indomitus prope qualis undas/exercet Auster Pleiadum choro/scindente nubis*, with K. Quinn (1980) *ad loc.*, 'The picture of the South Wind engaged in battle with the waves of the untamable sea and driving them back scarcely fires the imagination and is not improved by the unusual and unexpectedly gauche *prope qualis*'; and Catullus 68.131 *aut nihil aut paulo cui* [sc. *Laodamiae*] *tum concedere digna/lux mea*, with Fordyce (1961) *ad loc.*, '"little or not at all", a curiously prosaic phrase, and a curiously unromantic caution in this context . . .'.

41–50:

The point in Hypermestra's narrative when she must confess to Lynceus that she did indeed attempt to murder him, delayed by the extended similes of 39–41 (on similes as a narrative brake, cf. 11.77–8n.), can be put off no longer. Having avoided mention of Lynceus in her account so far, she suddenly throws the spotlight on him: *ipse iacebas* occupies a particularly emphatic position, directly after a sense-pause at the bucolic diaeresis. As at the beginning of her narrative (19–20n.), so too here Hypermestra employs rhetoric in an attempt to soften the blow; this time, however, the rhetoric has to be even more effective, because of the impending admission at 45ff. See nn. below.

42 quaeque tibi dederam causa soporis erant: 'What I gave you [i.e. sexual pleasure] was the cause of sleep.' The paradosis *quaeque tibi dederam vina soporis erant*, printed by Dörrie and other edd., is indefensible, although defences have on occasion been attempted: thus L.C. Purser in Palmer, 'the wine that I gave you was drugged'; Ehwald (1900), 'the wine that I gave you was soporific'; L. Giangrande (1966) 156, 'what I gave you was a sleeping-draft consisting in wine'. All involve an unfeasible use of the genitive *soporis*, for which the 'parallels' adduced offer no support: see A.E. Housman (1937) 47, and J. Diggle (1972) 35; note Housman's characteristic slight on Ehwald's citations, 'Why not adduce Verg. *Aen.* 1.1 "Troiae . . . oris"?' Moreover, as Housman notes (loc. cit.), 'Who says *vina, quae dederam, soporifica erant* when he means *dederam vina soporifica*? for not a word has hitherto been heard of any wine offered to Lynceus by Hypermestra. And who says *iacebas vina**que** soporifica erant* when he means *iacebas, vina **enim** soporifica erant*?'

Two conjectures attempt to salvage some sense while retaining *vina*. J.P. Postgate (1894–1905) suggests *quemque tibi dederant vina, soporis eras* ('you belonged to the sleep that wine had given to you'), which Housman, who makes no conjecture of his own, quotes without disapproval (loc. cit.), citing *omnia noctis erant*, Ovid's famous 'improvement' of Varro (Seneca *Con.* 7.1.27). Diggle (loc. cit.), pointing out that 'there is a difference between "all things were night's" and "you were sleep's"', offers 'a conjecture which will not persuade the timid': *causaque quae dederam vina soporis erant* ('The cause of your sleep was the wine I had given').

But *vina* does not merit retaining. Lynceus is surely already *vinoque gravis somnoque* along with his brothers (cf. 33), and needs no more wine, drugged or not. Cf. Palmer in his *ap. crit.*, 'nulla autem vina dederant nuptae maritis qui semet ipsos in cena nuptiali invitavissent'. Realizing that the problem lies with *vina*, some scholars have offered more radical conjectures. Thus *quaeque tibi dederam **plena** soporis erant*, Palmer (1874), retained in Palmer (1898); ***causa** soporis*, Damsté (1905) 42; ***iuncta** soporis*, Birt (1882) 855, from the *iussa* of some mss., and wrongly reported as *uncta* by Dörrie. In each case, the sense is 'you were sleeping because of what I had given you'. *quae tibi dederam* is an elliptical expression for Hypermestra's contribution to her lovemaking with Lynceus. For *do* so used, see *OLD* s.v. *do* 4d, and C. Goldberg (1992) on *Priapea* 3.1; cf. the Greek παρέχειν. For

quod/quae do, see *Am.* 1.4.64, *Ars* 1.454, 2.576, Martial 4.7.1; cf. Suetonius *Jul.* 493 . . . *quando notum est et quid ille tibi et quid illi tute dederis*, attributed to Cicero, on Caesar's relationship with Nicomedes.

Of these three conjectures, Palmer's and Birt's are motivated by a misplaced concern to provide something that bears a palaeographical resemblance to *vina* (cf. Damsté on Palmer, 'nimium curans litterarum similitudinem'). Damsté's palaeographical justification of his own *causa* is convincing: *vina* (or perhaps *vinum*, later becoming plural *metri gratia*) was written above *causa* as a gloss; *causa* was then taken as belonging to line 43, and *vina* took its place in 42. Damsté himself notes that the first hand of P in line 43 reads *causa* for *iussa*; Dörrie's finding of two thirteenth century mss. that preserve *causa soporis erant* in 42 further vindicates Damsté's explanation.

Palmer is usually credited with being the first to recognize the correct sense of our line: so e.g. Damsté, 'et mihi quoque vir sagacissimus post multa tandem saecula veram versus sententiam videtur perspexisse'. In fact, it had been spotted two hundred years earlier:

> While you in the soft Bonds of Sleep lay fast,
> Charmed with the Joys of Love, then newly past.
> (Wright's translation, in J. Dryden (1680))

There have been objections, often coyly expressed, to any allusion to lovemaking between Hypermestra and Lynceus: 'Hypermestra never appeals to Lynceus on the ground of their love', Purser, in Palmer (1898) 31; 'Comme il s'agit d'une nuit de noces, certains commentateurs . . . attribuent d'autres causes à ce sommeil; mais leur hypothèse est en contradiction avec la suite, notamment avec le v. 55', Bornecque-Prévost; 'The *sum virgo* in line 55 is undeniably lapalissien', Giangrande (1966) 154; 'All the conjectures are refuted by Hypermestra herself at line 55: *femina sum et virgo.* There have been no favours', Diggle (1972) 35. Cf. Shuckburgh, the coyest of all, 'The genitive *soporis* is doubtless bold, and I am inclined to think that some emendation may be wanted, though for more reasons than one I cannot accept Palmer's'; and Ehwald, who claims that the conjectures of Birt and Palmer destroy the uniformity of characterization:

> Der ganze Zusammenhang und die Einheitlichkeit der Charakteristik wird aufgehoben durch die Vermutung Birts . . . und die Palmers. . . . Versuchte Ovid in diesen Versen dem Leser den Gemütszustand seiner Heldin verständlich zu machen, so erfährt im folgenden die Handlung einen Fortschritt.
> (Ehwald (1900) 16–7)

Ehwald misses the point: concerning what happened on the wedding-night, there is no 'Einheitlichkeit der Charakteristik', nor is 'der Gemütszustand seiner Heldin' laid out for the reader: Hypermestra is coy about her actions and motivations that night, and Ovid is keen to play games with the discordant sources (see intro.). At 123–4, Hypermestra appears to make a subtle appeal to her wedding-night lovemaking with Lynceus (n.); and 55, while allowing the reader to believe that sexual intercourse has not taken place, is by no means an unambiguous assertion of Hypermestra's virginity (n.). Conversely, our line is no unambiguous assertion of sex having taken place: while the elegiacally-experienced (and, in particular, Ovidian) reader will read *quae/quod do* as sexual (see above for the predominantly Ovidian examples of *quae/quod do*), others, like Bornecque-Prévost who print *causa soporis erant* but take it to refer to wine, will happily supply as antecedent to *quae* whatever word they like.

43–4 excussere . . . erigor:
Emphatic verbs revert the reader's focus back to Hypermestra, and express her resolve to do something unpleasant. For *excutio*, cf. 10.13 *excussere metus somnum*. For *erigor* of standing up, see in Ovid only *Met.* 9.518, 10.378, and 13.234; each instance is in a context where undertones of resolve and determination are appropriate (*TLL* s.v. *erigor* 779.82ff.).

43 violenti iussa parentis:
Hypermestra's fear, which will eventually act towards holding her back from the murder (49), is temporarily displaced by her father's commands. The gentle appeal at 19 that she was only acting under orders (*fungi*, with 19–20n.) is here made explicit, *iussa parentis*; cf. further 48 *tela paterna* and 53 *saevus . . . pater, iussa parentis*. In our line *violenti* strengthens the appeal: the orders of one who is violent must be obeyed.

44 capio tela tremente manu:
As at 18, Hypermestra presents a trembling hand as evidence of her reluctance to commit murder. There, the trembling was striking because it affected her even as she recalled the wedding-night. Here, it is striking because the hand trembles despite the fact that, at this point in the narrative, her fear has just been surpressed (43). Hypermestra here has it both ways: she conveys her reluctance by stressing

both her violent father's role in overriding her natural abhorrence (43) and also, simultaneously, the continuation of that abhorrence manifested in her trembling hand. Note in *tela tremente* the juxtaposition of cause and effect. As at 18, minor personification of the hand (*tremente manu*) prepares the reader for more elaborate personification (see below).

45–6:
As Hypermestra makes her admission, that she attempted to murder her addressee, the careful rhetoric continues. She presents her attempt to fulfill the *violenti iussa parentis* as sincere but doomed to failure: repeated *ter* in the description of earnest but vain attempts is common (cf. 4.7–8), at home in epic (Virgil *Aen.* 2.792–3 = 6.700–1), and goes back to Homer (*Il.* 18.155–8, *Od.* 11.206–8). See Palmer *ad loc.* At the same time, the intended victim remains nameless, and the purpose of the sword is only hinted at (*acutum*): both of these will finally be revealed explicitly in the next couplet, following yet another expression of reluctance. Personification of the hand (5n.) keeps Hypermestra herself out of the picture: the struggle over whether or not to brandish the sword is presented in the third person (*sustulit, reccidit*), with the subject (*manus*) delayed until the end of the couplet. *male sublato* (46) refers primarily to the difficulty with which the sword was raised (for male = 'with difficulty, but nonetheless succeeding', cf. *Ars* 2.660 *sit gracilis, macie quae male viva sua est*), but also hints at moral condemnation of its raising ('with evil intent'; see *OLD* s.v. *male* 2)—cf. 11 *non bene tradidit.* Damsté (1905) 43, in conjecturing *mea* for *male,* blows Hypermestra's cover too soon.

45 non ego falsa loquar:
A final delay before Hypermestra makes her admission, *non ego falsa loquar* corresponds to *sed tamen experiar* at 21. Just as tales of past sufferings begin with expressions of reluctance (21n.), so telling revelations begin with assertions of candour, particularly if the tale is dissembling: so e.g. Sinon's *cuncta equidem tibi, rex, fuerit quodcumque, fatebor/vera,* which precedes one of the few elements of truth in Sinon's story to the Trojans, namely that he is Greek, *Aen.* 2.77–8; cf. Austin (1964) *ad loc.*, 'Did the Trojans not know what "I will be perfectly frank" so often means?' However, cheeky as Hypermestra's assertion is given her carefully persuasive rhetoric, she is no Sinon.

46 reccidit:
The perfect of *recĭdo* is always syncopated, regularly in the form *reccidi* (cf. in Ovid *Rem.* 611, *Met.* 10.180), and perhaps also *recidi* (thus the accepted text at Cicero *Ver.* 5.163 is *reciderunt*, at *Planc.* 90 *recidissent*, and at Livy 2.7.8 *recidisse*; but see Palmer on 12.165 '*rĕpuli* . . . is a false quantity; *re-* is invariably long in compound perfects when the reduplication is dropped, as *reppuli, reccidi, rettuli* (for *retetuli*), *repperi* . . .', and cf. Bessone (1997) there and Lewis-Short s.v. *recido* '[The perfect is] *reccidi*, better than *recidi*'). On the present stem *reccid-*, a metrically convenient alternative to *recid-*, rightly conjectured at *Met.* 6.212 *reccidat* and 10.18 *reccidimus*, see C. Bailey (1947) 1.132. The syncopated perfect was conjectured in our line, as *rĕcidit*, by Heinsius (not Burman, as claimed by Dörrie), and was subsequently recorded as a ms. reading by some edd. (given by W, and possibly the reading of G *ante correctionem*, according to Dörrie). Most edd. have accepted it. It gives better sense ('falls back') than *decidit* ('falls down', preferred by Riese and Giomini) the best of the other readings, which include the unmetrical (*cecidit*) and the nonsensical (*condidit*). For scribal confusion when faced with syncopated forms, cf. 11.61n. *aisti*.

47 admovi iugulo—sine me tibi vera fateri:
The ms. readings differ widely here, but can be summarized as follows:

I tandem victa mei saeva formidine patris
II at rursus monitis iussuque coacta parentis
III admovi iugulo—sine me tibi vera fateri

See Dörrie. Each version serves further to delay the revelation of 48: **III** by means of a parenthesis that restates the claim to truthfulness made in 45, **I** and **II** by describing the return of her father's influence (43) after failed attempts to raise the sword (45–6).

II can be dismissed with some ease. Dörrie's objections include the clumsiness of *at rursus* and the dubious Latin of *monitis iussuque coacta*. I add a point of metre: a word scanning as an amphibrach (*coacta*) at this *sedes*, while not uncommon in hexameter verse, including *Met.*, is very rare in elegiacs (Platnauer *LEV* 10).

Either **I** or **III** (or neither) may be what Ovid wrote; and, stylistically at any rate, there is little to choose between them.

In **I**, preferred by Dörrie, the repetition *patris* . . . *paterna* may be considered either the mark of a clumsy interpolator, or a sound

rhetorical device to stress the influence of Danaus (see 9n. *pater* for the continuous presence of Hypermestra's father; and 19–20n., 43n. *violenti iussa parentis*, 53n. for Hypermestra's attempts to present herself as under orders). However, the description of the paternal influence as *formidine patris* adds unnecessary confusion: elsewhere in this passage, fear is what works against her father's orders (43, 49).

III entails repetition of *admovi iugulo*, in which Dörrie sees the hand of an interpolator; but this kind of repetition was favoured by the rhetoricians (Quintilian 9.3.29), nor was Ovid averse to it (12.135–6 *ausus es—o iusto desunt sua verba dolori!—/ausus es 'Ausonia' dicere 'cede domo!'*, an uncontested reading; cf. Wills (1996) 106). The parenthesis follows a standard pattern: see M. von Albrecht (1964) 33, 3c for parenthesis at this *sedes*, and 121–2 for '(I'm telling the truth)'; for *vera fateor*, cf. e.g. *Met.* 9. 53 (in parenthesis) and Virgil *Aeneid* 2.77–8. It is a point in **III**'s favour that Horace's Hypermestra poem contained an instance of the same rhetorical device (*Carm.* 3.11.30–2 *inpiae (nam quid potuere maius?),/impiae sponsos potuere duro/perdere ferro*).

In palaeographical terms, **III** has the clear advantage that it explains the presence of the other variants. 47 **III** would easily have fallen out of the text through homoioarchon (just as two mss. omit 12.135 before 12.136), and conjectures then made to fill the lacuna. Some mss. subsequently gathered variants together: one thirteenth century ms. (f 6) displays them as a series with further conjectures inserted to produce couplets.

III is either the original version of the line, preserved in part of the tradition, or else a good attempt at restoration; that it is the latter might be suggested by the fact it also existed in a slightly different form, *admovi iugulo—liceat mihi vera fateri*, found in one ms.

49–50:

The personified hand (*casta . . . dextra*) is joined by *timor* and *pietas* in its attempts to put a stop to the murder; on this pair[4] of motivating factors, cf. 4n. This couplet picks up 5–6, and provides a fuller and more honest account of the claim made there: we here learn explicitly that, although 5 *manus extimuit iugulo demittere ferrum* is true, it is not the whole story, as Hypermestra did indeed make the attempt, 47–8; and that the *iugulo* (5) was Lynceus' (48 *tuo*, postponed until

[4] Might Heinsius' *et timor et pietas* for *sed timor et pietas* be worth considering?

line- and sentence-end). Similarly, 6 *si scelus ausa forem* implied that Hypermestra didn't even attempt the murder, an implication countered by 49 *obstitit ausis*. These disclosures are softened by rhetoric: Hypermestra condemns the attempt as cruel (49 *crudelibus . . . ausis*), even though it was she who attempted it; and she characterizes it as a *mandatum . . . opus*, by which she may mean 'entrusted by herself to the hand' (note the etymological play in the juxtaposition *mandatum dextra*), but which could be taken as 'entrusted by Danaus', and therefore not her idea—cf. 43 and 53 *iussa parentis*, and 19 *fungi* (19–20n.).

50 castaque . . . dextra:

The hand's continued refusal to encompass murder earns it the epithet *casta*. *castus* is applied to hands at 19.10, *Fast.* 4.324, 6.290; but Hypermestra's *casta dextra* is to be seen in the wider context of the 'personification of the hand' motif. The sense is 'Free from vice, upright, moral' (*OLD* s.v. *castus* 2), almost a synonym for *pia*, but the choice of a word more usually used of sexual purity (*OLD* q.v. 4) is tantalizing, given the prominent issue of whether sex has taken place (33n. *iamque*, 42n., 55n., 123–4n.). Perhaps Hypermestra has applied *casta* to the *dextra* in an attempt to avoid the issue of whether it could be applied to herself. In any case, the adjective is resolutely unhelpful to any prurient enquirer: *castus* may be used not only of virgins and attributes associated with them, but also of faithful wives (Ovidian instances 1.23, 5.133, 13.30, 16.295, *Am.* 3.4.3, 3.4.36, 3.4.41, *Ars* 1.623, 2.400, *Fast.* 2.139, 4.260, 4.307, 4.324, 5.242, *Met.* 2.544, *Trist.* 2.308). The fact that Hypermestra appears still to be wearing the previous day's clothes when she rises from bed (51 *purpureos . . . sinus*) is intriguing in this context.

51–2:

Hypermestra attempts to convey her distress at being torn between murder and disobedience. The standard outward sign of anguish, tearing of clothes and hair, is emphasised by anaphora in asyndeton: for anaphora in this metrical position, cf. e.g. Tibullus 2.1.5, *luce sacra requiescat humus, requiescat arator*. However, she lets slip two passing details that undermine this pathetic picture: first, that the *sinus* that she tore were *purpureos*, an unnecessary assertion of her royal status; second, that she delivered the soliloquy that she now goes on to report in a whisper, *exiguo . . . sono*, presumably lest she wake the sleeping Lynceus.

51 laniata:

A verb of which Ovid is fond: see McKeown (1989) on *Am.* 1.7.11–12. The participle is here likely to have a 'middle' sense, 'tearing the purple dress, etc.', as at e.g. *Met.* 4.139–140 *et laniata comas amplexaque corpus amatum/vulnera supplevit lacrimis* and 6.531 *mox, ubi mens rediit, passos laniata capillos.* Accusative of direct object after a 'middle' participle appears to have been a construction native to Latin—not borrowed from Greek like the passive participle with accusative of respect, from which it is often indistinguishable (e.g. at *Am.* 3.9.51–2 *hic soror in partem misera cum matre doloris/venit inornatas dilaniata comas* does Tibullus' sister approach her brother's deathbed tearing her hair, or with her hair torn?). See Fordyce (1961) on Catullus 64.64–5 *contecta . . . pectus, . . . vincta papillas*, and Austin (1964) on Virgil *Aen.* 2.57 *manus . . . revinctum.*

52 talia verba:

Hypermestra now goes on to report in direct speech her soliloquy of vacillating resolve. That it is introduced as *talia verba* may be significant: such phrases are used by the historians to introduce a 'plausible fiction' (McKeown (1989) on *Am.* 1.8.21–2); when a speech reported by its speaker is introduced with such a phrase, the effect is different:

> Here [at *Am.* 1.8.21–2], however, the phrasing does not imply that Dipsas' speech is in any way fictitious, thereby casting doubts on the authenticity of the whole incident. At *Epist.* 14.52, for example, Hypermestra introduces a report of a speech which she herself had made with the words *exiguo dixi talia verba sono. . . .*
>
> (McKeown loc. cit.)

In our line, it may indicate nothing more than Hypermestra's uncertain memory of what she said; or it may attempt to explain, and thereby draw our attention to, the incongruity of delivering such a speech, albeit in hushed tones (*exiguo sono*), at the bedside of the sleeping Lynceus, and in convenient elegiac couplets. It might even suggest that Hypermestra has censored her actual words for the benefit of Lynceus.

The speech of vacillating resolve is a common motif, particularly at home in tragedy (most famously Euripides *Medea* 1021ff.). Here, Ovid gives it a new twist, through a novel combination of tragic and elegiac elements. In what A.F. Sabot (1981) 2609 terms 'un mouvement d'oscillation pendulaire', the couplets alternately advo-

cate and condemn the intended murder: the result bears more than a passing resemblance to tragic stichomythia, and has something in common with the tragic apostrophe of the θυμός or *animus*, but is at the same time ideal for elegiac couplets, and firmly grounded in elegy through a series of elegiac motifs, on which see Spoth (1992) 192. Spoth, moreover, regards 53–66 as a conflict between elegiac and tragic elements, '"elegische Positionsbeschreibung", *recusatio* des Kriegerischen' (loc. cit.), introduced with the genre-marker *exiguus* (loc. cit. and p. 44). Our passage may also owe a debt to the Roman rhetorical exercise the *controversia*, which involved setting out the arguments on either side for a proposed legal dilemma (for snippets of an Ovidian *controversia*, see Seneca *Con.* 2.2.9–11). Note in particular the epigrammatic paradoxes of 59–60 and 63–4 (nn.).

The tragic elements of the speech may have been suggested by a specific tragedy. Ovid may have had in mind the trial scene postulated by some scholars for Aeschylus' *Danaides* (4n. and 6–7n.), in which Hypermestra would have faced an interrogator and defended her actions. In our passage, the voice that refuses murder is identified with Hypermestra herself (55 *sum*, 59 *haec* = 'this one of mine', 64, 65 *mihi*, 66 *meis*), while the voice that advocates it is external, addressing its opponent as Hypermestra (53)—a sensible ploy to identify herself in Lynceus' eyes strongly with the former, but perhaps also suggestive of a forensic interrogation.

Hypermestra's speech of deliberation almost certainly did not occur in Aeschylus' trilogy (the events of the wedding-night were probably not depicted on stage: see 25–8n.), and Ovid's is the only literary version extant. There is, however, a tantalizing possibility that Ovid may have drawn inspiration from a depiction in art. A first century A.D. marble statue of a girl sitting on a rock in a contemplative pose, a dagger in her right hand partially hidden by her scant clothing, is agreed to represent Hypermestra (*LIMC* s.v. *Hypermestra* 2). Some scholars (e.g. P. Arndt (1937), H. Meyer (1983) 97) have attempted to identify it as the Hypermestra among the Danaids in front of the temple of Apollo on the Palatine, described by Augustan poets, including Ovid at *Am.* 2.2.4 and *Trist.* 3.1.61–2 (2n. *cetera . . . turba*).

Apuleius' account of Psyche at the bedside of her husband Cupid, uncertain whether or not to decapitate him as her sisters have advised, may draw on our passage (Apuleius *Met.* 5.21, with Kenney (1990) *ad loc.*).

53–4:

The voice advocating murder is the first to speak, with a terse command that Hypermestra follow her father's orders and her sisters' example. The tone is urgent: the point is made in three short sentences in asyndeton, the second of which spills breathlessly from hexameter to pentameter and ends at first foot diairesis with the emphatic imperative *effice*. The similarity of Lynceus to his brothers, and thus the similar fate he deserves, is stressed by *comes* and *germanis* (on the close bond conveyed by *germanus*, cf. 11.89n.). With *iste*, the speaker points to the sleeping Lynceus, expressing her contempt and associating him with her addressee (for the demonstrative and 'distancing' senses of *iste*, cf. 11.97–8n.). The sibilance of the couplet suits the harshness of the command; but it may also reproduce the whisper (52 *exiguo sono*). For sibilant whisperings, cf. e.g. Horace *S.* 2.8.77–8 '*tum in lecto quoque videres/stridere secreta divisos aure susurros*', with the scholiast *ad loc.*, *et notandum, quod ipso versu imitatus est sonum susurri* (in O. Keller (1904)). If that is Ovid's point, he drops it once made—the sibilance does not continue throughout the whispered speech.

55 femina sum et virgo:

femina and, in particular, *virgo* are slippery words. P. Watson (1983) 122 characterizes the basic sense of *virgo* as '"an unmarried girl of respectable morals"', but not necessarily inviolate; 'young female' and 'sexually uninitiated female' (and, very rarely, male) are developments from that basic sense. Ovid here exploits these different shades of meaning. Some scholars have seen in *virgo* an unambiguous assertion by Ovid that his Hypermestra has not had sex with Lynceus (cf. 42n.). But the narrator is, of course, not Ovid but Hypermestra, who has good reason to be coy about such things; and at any rate *virgo* is by no means an unambiguous assertion of virginity. Hypermestra clearly sets out, in *natura mitis et annis*, how she wishes *femina sum et virgo* to be interpreted: as an expression of her age and gender. Palmer quotes Ruhnken's neat observation 'mitis natura, quia femina, mitis annis quia virgo'. But Hypermestra can hardly have expected any reader to leave *femina . . . et virgo* at that. Ovid often uses *virgo* with the sense 'biological virgin' uppermost: Watson 129 cites examples, which include one from the *Heroides* (5.129 *a iuvene, et cupido, credatur reddita virgo?*, of Theseus and Helen). Given that Hypermestra's sexual status is an issue, *virgo* as = 'bio-

logical virgin' is tantalizing. Furthermore, *femina . . . et virgo*, when pressed, can appear as a paradox: 'I am a married woman and an unmarried woman' (*OLD* s.v. *femina* 2 'A woman (in the capacity of wife)')—an ideal phrase for one whose marital status is in doubt, and a gentle sounding-out of Lynceus' attitudes to their relationship in preparation for her subtle appeal to him as her husband (123–4n.).

Other paradoxes that draw on the various nuances of the word *virgo* include *Her.* 6.133–4 *turpiter illa virum cognovit* ***adultera virgo***, */me tibi teque mihi taeda pudica dedit*, on which see Watson 132; and Horace *Carm.* 2.8.21–4 *te suis matres metuunt iuvencis,/te senes parci miseraeque nuper/* ***virgines nuptae***, *tua ne retardet/aura maritos*, on which see Watson loc. cit. and R.G.M. Nisbet – M. Hubbard (1978) *ad loc.* for two different interpretations.

Hypermestra's proclamation of herself as *virgo* may allude to Horace's description of Hypermestra as *virgo* (*Carm.* 3.11.35) and the Danaids as *virgines* (*Carm.* 3.11.26). Horace himself may have been playing with the word: in his Ode, Hypermestra is an exemplum offered to the impressionable and sexually inexperienced Lyde, who might have welcomed the reference to Hypermestra's love for Lynceus (50 *Venus*), while at the same time identifying with this perpetual virgin (35 *in omne virgo/nobilis aevum*—taking *in omne . . . aevum* with *virgo*; one might equally take it with *nobilis*).

sum et:

For *sum et*, cf. 5.85 *dignaque sum et cupio fieri matrona potentis*, (a contested reading). Elision of monosyllables other than *me/te/se* is not frequent in Ovid. Platnauer *LEV* 78 records only twelve Ovidian incidences, and notes that 'monosyllabic elision in the elegists occurs usually before a long initial vowel', by which, it emerges, he means 'before a long initial syllable', as here. See further J. Soubiran (1966) 412ff.

56:

A neat expression of the idea that a sword is out of place in a woman's hand (cf. 11.21–2 . . . *ferrum/feminea teneo, non mea tela, manu*). For *mollis* used almost as a synonym for *femineus* (cf. 11.22 *feminea*), see *OLD* q.v. 3 'Soft, tender. (a) (as typical of women; also of emasculated males)'. Here *molles*, applied to Hypermestra's hands, picks up *femina, virgo* and *mitis* above: 'I am a gentle young woman; the hands of gentle young women (= *molles*) are unsuited to fierce weapons'. The word is chosen to form a contrast with *fera*, a common epithet

for weapons (*OLD* s.v. *ferus* 7), and to continue the personification of the *manus* (*mollis* = 'belonging to a woman', but also 'Gentle, conciliatory, complaisant, kindly', *OLD* s.v. *mollis* 11).

non faciunt . . . ad:
'Are not compatible with', 'do not go with' (*OLD* s.v. *facio* 29b). *facere ad* occurs first, and frequently, in Ovid. McKeown (1989) on *Am.* 1.2.16 *ad arma facit* regards the idiom as a development of the technical term from animal-training *facere* = 'be obedient', 'adapt oneself'.

57–8:
The external voice answers in urgent and colloquial terms. *quin age*, which occurs in Ovid only here, appears to have been introduced into poetic style by Virgil (Austin (1955) on *Aen.* 4.99). It indicates a challenge, 'come on, then' (R.F. Thomas (1988) on *Georg.* 4.329), and may here suggest an objection to the previous speaker's words (*OLD* s.v. *quin* 2b): 55–6 state that women are unsuited to brandishing weapons; 57–8 reply that 49 women have already taken up arms, with *fortes* countering 55 *mitis* and 56 *molles*. *iacet* is preferable to the rather banal variants *licet* and *placet*: cf. 41 *ipse iacebas*. The lack of expressed subject for *iacet* may, like 54 *iste*, indicate distaste (cf. 31–2n.). The prosaic phrase *credibile est* = 'it is probable (that)', frequent in Ovid but otherwise rare in verse (McKeown (1989) on *Am.* 1.11.11–2), is here no idle filler: Hypermestra, and the 'voice', can only deduce the murder of all the other husbands from the *gemitus morientum* (35). *omnibus* is terse: '*omnibus* may be the dative of agent . . .; or the ethical dative: "they have each slain their man"' (Palmer *ad loc.*).

59–60:
The gentle Hypermestra's reply is paradoxical: the *manus* would rather slay its own *domina* than commit any other murder. Murder of one's *domina* or *dominus* would, under normal circumstances, be the most heinous of crimes. Cf. *Am.* 1.7.29–30, *an, si pulsassem minimum de plebe Quiritem,/plecterer, in dominam ius mihi maius erit?*, where the *servitium amoris* (the *domina* is there the elegiac *puella*) produces a similar paradox. In our couplet the *domina* is Hypermestra herself. For the device whereby characters are termed *dominus/domina* of a part of their own body, see 11.4n. The argument of this couplet picks up that of the preceding one: 59 *caedem* picks up 58 *caesos; caede* for *morte* in 60,

recorded as the reading of one ms. by Giomini and considered a possibility by Hall (1990) 282, might overplay the point. *morte* is in its turn picked up by *necem* in 61.

60 sanguinolenta:
Ovid seems to have been almost alone among Latin poets in reckoning that the *color* of *sanguinolentus* outweighed its metrical awkwardness. The word occurs fifteen times in the Ovidian *corpus*. Tibullus and Seneca experimented with it once each (Tibullus 2.6.40, Sen. *Ag.* 82). Cf. McKeown (1989) on *Am.* 1.12.12.

61, 114:
Dorrie, following the majority of mss., prints 61–2 *aut meruere necem patruelia regna tenendo,/quae tamen externis danda forent generis?* ('Or have they earned death by possessing their uncle's realms, which would otherwise have had to be given to sons-in-law outside the family?'), an argument against the slaughter of Aegyptus' sons. But this would entail that the murderous voice has conceded the argument, before its outcome has been decided, after only two utterances, 53–4 and 57–8, thus allowing her opponent four couplets (59–66) to press home her point unopposed. It is preferable that the alternating pattern established in 53–60 should here continue, with 61–2 an argument in support of the murder. 61 *aut* is a corruption of either *at* or, perhaps more likely, *hanc*, both are found in a small number of mss. The inconsistency of Palmer's text (*at meruere necem*) with the commentary note ('The sense seems to be: surely our cousins have not deserved death . . .') is perhaps due to the incomplete nature of his work. Concerning the pentameter, the analysis of Housman (1897b) 288–9, unreported by Dörrie, is persuasive: verses 61 and 114 are a couplet, to be located between 60 and 63; 62 *quae tamen externis danda forent generis* and 113 *ille ferox solus solio sceptroque potitur* are interpolations (cf. 113n.), fabricated after the misplacement of 114. The correct reading is:

61 hanc meruere necem patruelia regna tenendo:
114 cum sene nos inopi turba vagamur inops.
63 finge viros etc.

and 115–6 follows on immediately from 111–2. Exactly this is given by one thirteenth century ms., Go. W gives the same, but misplaced, after 118. It is likely that P too exhibited this reading before the

intervention of a second hand: after 61, the line has been erased (it is tempting to think that it gave 114 *cum sene nos* etc.), and 62 supplied in the margin; 113–4 are supplied in the margin after 112. That 62 is given by the mss. in a variety of forms (. . . *danda forent generis*, . . . *data forent generis*, . . . *regna tenenda forent*, . . . *accipienda forent*) lends weight to the argument that it is an interpolation. Its trisyllabic ending, though, is no fatal charge against it, since this metrical practice in Ovid is not confined to the exile poetry, as has regularly been thought (e.g. Platnauer *LEV* 15–6): Ovid *Phaenomena FLP* 4 *cur ego non dicam, Furia, te furiam.*

It is not difficult to imagine a scenario in which the displacement and interpolations might have arisen. A scribe was thrown by the alternating argument and, finding 114 between 61 and 63, regarded it as inappropriate there and more at home in the passage where we now find it. If the ms. from which he was copying gave *an*, *aut*, *haud*, *non*, or *quid* (all are found in extant mss.) as the first word of 61, his misapprehension is all the more explicable.

Luck (1969) 34, who believes that 113–4 is a genuine couplet after 111–2, regards the fact that 114 appears in some mss. around 61–2 as evidence of a thirteen-line page in the archetype; but his arguments are tortuous (see Reeve (1973), 335).

The murderous voice argues that the sons of Aegyptus deserve to die because of their harsh treatment of their uncle Danaus and his daughters. They have, it asserts, taken possession of a kingdom that is not their own: *OLD* s.v. *teneo* 11 'To hold (property) irrespective of legal right of ownership or *possessio*'; there is no need to suspect *tenendo* (Dörrie obelizes; Palmer conjectures *petendo*). As a result (114), Danaus and his daughters have been forced into exile.

The knowledgeable reader, able to see through the rhetoric, may have reason to regard these assertions as somewhat desperate. In 114, the polyptoton *inopi* . . . *inops* makes a pathetic plea, but to call Danaus and his daughters *inops* is stretching things a little: contrast the opulence of the wedding ceremony (23–6), and of Hypermestra's clothes (51). *vagamur* is equally hyperbolic, since their wanderings have come to an end in Argos. *sene* too, with its pathetic connotations, hardly sounds like the grimly determined Danaus we find both elsewhere in this epistle and in the rest of the mythographical tradition.

Similarly, the hexameter 61, which describes a hostile act on the part of the sons of Aegyptus, may be a distortion of mythological

'truth'. Scholiastic versions of the myth discuss the reasons behind Danaus' wanting his nephews dead: in none of them are the sons of Aegyptus themselves the aggressors, although in Eustathius on Homer *Il.* 1.42 and Schol. Aeschylus *Prom.* 853, Danaus fears them because of an oracle. In only one version (Hyginus *Fab.* 168) is Aegyptus the aggressor, with his sons fighting on his behalf. In Pseudo-Apollodorus *Bib.* 2.1 and Servius on *Aen.* 10.497, a quarrel is mentioned between Aegyptus and Danaus, but neither party is singled out as instigating it; and the scholiast on Euripides *Hec.* 886 refers to Danaus as the antagonist, hounding Aegyptus because he envies him his male offspring. Aeschylus' trilogy almost certainly did not contain reference to the quarrel between the brothers: see Garvie (1969) 171 and 185 for the largely discredited views of scholars who have thought otherwise. Cf. 111–2n. for further selective presentations of the background to the myth.

61 patruelia regna:
The place where—and, in some versions of the myth, concerning which—the quarrel arises is regularly given as Egypt: see Euripides *Archelaus* fr. 228 Nauck, P. Oxy. 3707 (on which see W. Luppe (1986)), Pausanias 2.16.1, Servius on *Aen.* 10.497. Cf. Hyginus *Fab.* 168, where Danaus flees *ex Africa.* In Schol. Euripides *Hec.* 886, the quarrel begins in an unspecified place, and is subsequently continued first in Egypt then in Argos (Bonner (1902) 130 assumes that the unspecified place is Argos, to which Aegyptus subsequently returns after a time as exile in Egypt). According to Pseudo-Apollodorus *Bib.* 2.1.4, Eustathius on *Il.* 1.42, and Schol. Aeschylus *Prom.* 853, Danaus and Aegyptus ruled Libya and Arabia respectively, before Aegyptus conquered, and gave his name to, the land of Egypt. Cf. 111–2n. *regnoque domoque/pellimur; eiectos. . . .*

patruelia regna is another rhetorically persuasive phrase, since it may encompass both 'the kingdom of their uncle, Danaus' (*OLD* s.v. *patruelis* 1) and 'the kingdom of their cousins, we Danaids' (*OLD* q.v. 2b)—the affront is presented as against both the father and the daughters.

A myth that involves two brothers and their respective children makes *patruelis* an obvious word to use: see e.g. Hyginus *Fab.* 168 *impetratas sorores patrueles acceperunt uxores.* But there may yet be some significance in the fact that Ovid uses *patruelis* four times in connection with the Danaids; in each passage except ours it is a substantive, 'cousin', and the phrasing is very similar: *Ars* 1.73 *quaque parare*

necem miseris patruelibus ausae; *Met.* 4.462 *molirique suis letum patruelibus ausae*; *Ibis* 353 *quaeque parare suis letum patruelibus ausae* (see Bömer (1969–1986) on *Met.* 4.462 for arguments concerning the authenticity of the *Ibis* that rest on these lines). It may be that Ovid is playing with a phrase from a lost version of the myth.

63–4:

A rhetorical flourish from the gentle Hypermestra wins her the argument. She takes her cue from her opponent: 63 *meruisse* picks up 61 *meruere*; and the first person plural of 63 *fecimus* picks up that of 114 *vagamur*. She then moves from plural to singular, from 'What have we done wrong?' to the more important 'What have I done wrong?' (64 *mihi*). The argument is sophistic and paradoxical: the crime of murdering Lynceus is presented as an undeserved punishment meted out on the perpetrator—'What have I done that I should not be allowed to be righteous?'. Hypermestra postulates a surprising victim—herself; one cannot but be reminded of the philosophical doctrine that wrongdoing is an evil for the wrongdoer. Cf. Seneca *Ep.* 7.5 *quia occidit, ille meruit ut hoc pateretur: tu quid meruisti ut hoc spectes?*, addressed to one who watches the death of a criminal in the arena. Surprising shifts of blame and victimhood make for good rhetorical *sententiae*: see e.g. Antiphon *Third Tetralogy* 4.5, where a man murdered by one acting in self defence is termed the murderer of himself.

With 63 *finge viros meruisse mori*, Hypermestra concedes a point in order that it be rendered invalid—a sound rhetorical technique: see Hollis (1970) on *Met.* 8.114; he notes a similarity with the Greek καὶ δὴ (= 'suppose that . . .'), on which A.C. Pearson (1903) on Euripides *Hel.* 1059 is brief but informative. Hypermestra does not expressly contradict *meruere necem* (note, in contrast, points denied before they are conceded at 10.63 and 16.353); rather, she retorts with a neutral 'suppose they did?' *quo . . . commisso* (*OLD* s.v. *committo* 17b) adds a forensic tone; so too does *fecimus* = *scelus fecimus*, an idiom from the law-courts ('Condemnation or acquital seems generally to have been declared by the phrase *fecisse* or *non fecisse videtur*', A.H.J. Greenidge (1901) 498).

64 piae:

The reading of *P*, and preferable to the alternative reading *piam* printed by Dörrie. See 4n. *piam*.

65–6:
'That [Hypermestra] has now won the argument is symbolized by the addition of another distich, sealing the dispute' (Jacobson (1974) 137–8). Cf. Catullus 62 for a similar device: 'Regarding themselves as the winners, the men take the last word and proceed to address their homily (59–65) to the bride. . . .' (Fordyce (1961) introduction to 62). The jingles *commisso . . . ferro* (64–5) and *ipsae . . . piae . . . puellae* (63–5), and the pattern of interrogatives, *quid . . . quo . . . quid . . . quo*, serve to link the couplets 63–4 and 65–6 together. The gentle Hypermestra brings her case to a resounding and forceful close, returning to her first point (55–6), that as a young woman she does not suit weapons. The tone is urgent, possibly colloquial. For *quid mihi cum ferro*, 'What have I got to do with swords?', see *OLD* s.v. *quis* 7a; the idiom is a favourite of Ovid's (Palmer *ad loc.*), conveys impatience and disgust (McKeown (1989) on *Am.* 1.7.27), and seems a colloquialism (Knox on *Her.* 6.47–8). For *quo bellica tela puellae*, 'What does a girl want with weapons of war?', see *OLD* s.v. *quo*[1] 2; *bellica tela* is accusative case (as is clear from e.g. Horace *Ep.* 1.5.12 and *Am.* 2.19.7 *quo mihi fortunam*, *Am.* 3.4.41 *quo tibi formosam*) with some verb supplied—J. Booth (1991) on *Am.* 2.19.7 suggests *volo*, M. Haupt – R. Ehwald (1915–6) on *Met.* 13.103 *do* or *concedo*; 'The ellipse of a verb . . . seems to suggest a colloquial *color*, but Bömer on *Met.* 13.516f. expresses reservations' (McKeown (1998) on *Am.* 2.19.7).

65 bellica tela:
bellica may be more crucial than at first appears: it makes clear that here *tela* are weapons (*telum*), and not the *tela* which, as part of the machinary of *lanificium*, would be wholly appropriate for a *puella*. However, the pun would be sharper if *tela* were grammatically ambiguous; in fact, 'What does a girl want with the loom' would require *quo* ***telam*** *puellae* (for the construction, see previous n.). Cf. 11.22n.

66:
A woman's fingers are suited not to weapons (cf. 56 and 11.22) but to *lanificium*, here symbolized by the wool (*lana*) and the distaff (*colus*). *lanificium* is the quintessential occupation of Roman women: Tibullus terms it *femineus labor* (2.1.63) and a famous epitaph from a husband for his wife ends with the words *domum servavit, lanam fecit. dixi. abei.* (*CIL* 1.2.1211). That it is regarded as a morally upright occupation

(see e.g. McKeown (1989) on 1.13.23–4 and P. Murgatroyd (1980) on Tibullus 1.6.77–84) helps the gentle Hypermestra's argument.

67–70:
A striking scene: the weeping heroine stands sword in hand over Lynceus as he reaches out to her in his sleep. Ovid may have in mind a scene in art. Two fourth century B.C. fragmentary red-figure vases appear to show the Danaids in their bedchambers standing over their sleeping husbands. The one (*LIMC* s.v. *Hypermestra* 5) shows the heads of two female figures beneath a roof; above one of the figures is the name *Hypermestra*; a separate fragment of the same vase shows the left leg of a figure on a bed. The other (*LIMC* s.v. *Danaides* 5) shows 'men on klinae and women with swords hovering around them' (*LIMC* loc. cit.). T.B.L. Webster (1967) 137 thinks that this latter pot represents a scene from Aeschylus' lost *Aegyptii*, but the murder was almost certainly not represented in Aeschylus' trilogy (25–8n.).

If Ovid is inspired by art, his tableau is nevertheless wholly literary. The speed of the metre (the couplet 67–8 is dactylic with midline pause in 67: cf. 21n.) and an abundance of main verbs all in historic present tense (*queror, sequuntur, cadunt, petis, iactas, facta . . . est*) bring the scene to life and convey the narrator's emotion.

67 dumque queror:
This particular jingle, involving juxtaposition of *-que* and *queror/querela* (for others see 11.18n., 13.73, 13.99, 14.73), is common in Ovid: see e.g. 91 (n.) of Io, 3.6, 19.25, 20.36, *Met.* 1.637 (Io again; but see 91n.), 2.371, etc.; and cf. e.g. Virgil *Aen.* 4.360. Perhaps the sound produced by the repeated syllable was thought to represent lament; but see my remarks on 11.18 *possidet et.*

lacrimae:
Tears clinch the gentle Hypermestra's victory over her opponent, since they demonstrate that she is not *fortis* (57), but *mitis* and *mollis* (55–6).

sua verba:
The relationship between two nouns which the possessive pronoun describes is, as Housman observed ((1900) 31 and (1916) 148), a mutual one. Thus Ovid can write both *lacrimae sua verba sequuntur*

here, and *et liceat lacrimis addere verba suis* at 20.78 (see Kenney *ad loc.*, = 20.76 in his numbering; Dörrie has the inferior *meis*).

68:
A fine pathetic image. Note the contrived word-order: *deque meis oculis* is matched by *in tua membra.*

69–70:
Lynceus stirs in his sleep (perhaps because of the tears that have fallen on him), and nearly injures himself on the outstretched sword—a vivid and humorously ironic detail. Compare the oil from Psyche's lamp that burns the shoulder of the sleeping Cupid at Apuleius *Met.* 5.23, an episode which perhaps alludes to ours (52n. *talia verba*). Like that passage of Apuleius, our couplet seems to demand allegorical interpretation; but in both cases (cf. Kenney (1990) on e.g. 5.23.4), more than one possibility suggests itself. Spoth (1992), 196 sees in our couplet genres at war—the generic incompatability of embraces and swords. Jacobson (1974) 396 interprets the couplet as a variation on 'the theme of groping, grasping, touching while asleep', comparing 8.111–4 and 10.9–14. I suggest in addition that comparison of Lynceus' *manus* with Hypermestra's own is inescapable: while Hypermestra's hand abstained from murder, Lynceus' through its clumsiness almost incurred accidental injury; 70 *tua* is perhaps stressed by hyperbaton ('your hand, as opposed to mine'). Note also that, while Hypermestra in her epistle is reticent in representing her own feelings for Lynceus, she represents Lynceus as straightforwardly amorous (69 *petis amplexus*). This is still no unambiguous assertion that sex has taken place (cf. 42n.), although the Lynceus that Hypermestra presents here seems unlikely to have spared Hypermestra's virginity (as he did in some versions: see 4n.): cf. Johansen-Whittle (1980) 1.49, 'Lynceus had not violated her virginity during the night . . . implicitly contradicted by Ov. *Her.* 14.69 and 124'. Lynceus may, if he wishes, take *petis amplexus* as a gentle reminder of, at the very least, affection displayed towards Hypermestra on their wedding night; Hypermestra is preparing the ground for her appeal for help: see 42n. and 55n. for other preparations for the appeal, and 123–4n. for the appeal itself. In describing Lynceus' near-wounding as he tried to embrace her, Hypermestra must hope that he is ignorant of the version of the myth where a similar action proved fatal for his brothers, murdered as they were being embraced in bed (see

Eustathius on *Il.* 1.42, quoted under 33n. *iamque*. Statius' account of the grisly death of Elymus at the hands of his wife Gorge (*Theb.* 5.212–7) may draw on that version of our myth).

69 petis amplexus:
Heinsius' *petis amplexu*, 'go for (me) with your embrace' merits mention (modern editors have ignored it): he cites among other examples 18.101 *excipis amplexu*.

bracchia iactas:
'Throw your arms', like a swimmer (18.58, 96, 19.48, *Met.* 5.596, *Pont.* 1.6.34, Lucan 3.651, 662), or a boxer (Virgil *Aen.* 5.376–7, Seneca *Nat.* 7.14.1), or even an affected orator (Quintilian *Inst.* 4.2.39). The phrase had lofty beginnings (Lucretius 4.769, propounding his theories on the apparent movement of images), but is ideal for any wild or forceful gesture—perfect, in fact, for the uncoordinated movements of one not fully awake: cf. Seneca *Her. F.* 1088.

71–2:
'Abruptly we realize that the events of the past 50 lines have occupied the whole night; dawn is approaching' (Jacobson (1974) 138), and Hypermestra, now resolved to disobey her father, fears lest Lynceus be found alive.

71 patrem . . . patris:
On such repetition in Latin, where English would use a pronoun, see 11.101n. *muneribus . . . conubia donas*. But the repeated *pater* is not without point: the influence of Danaus on Hypermestra's actions (9n. *pater*) continues even here, where she has resolved to disobey his orders.

famulosque:
A nice detail: she fears the arrival not only of Danaus but also of any representative of his. Cf. perhaps the bodyguard that Danaus receives in Aeschylus' *Supplices* (Winnington-Ingram (1961) 142, Garvie (1969) 195 and 199).

lucemque:
The light of dawn, when Lynceus, should he remain, would be discovered alive. *lucem . . . timebam* is a paradox: fear of the daylight is usually a symptom of those who have committed, rather than abstained from, a crime: note the example of Perseus king of Macedonia who,

having ordered the death of his friend Evander, . . . *timens lucem . . . prope angulum obscurum delituit* (Livy 45.6.6). For the motif of the virtuous crime in the epistle, see 4n.

timebam:
Fear of the arrival of Danaus, or of one of his minions, prompts Hypermestra to put Lynceus to flight: the reader is left to infer whether the fear is selfish (that she herself will be punished) or altruistic (that Danaus will personally complete the task of murdering his nephews). E. Oppel (1968) 75 and Spoth (1992) 193 claim that Hypermestra's decision to effect Lynceus' escape represents a further emotional development ('Gefühlsumschwung') from the decision to spare him which she reached at the end of her internal dialogue. The reason for this change is 'das zarte Erwachen der Liebe' according to Oppel, and 'Hilflosigkeit' according to Spoth. But no change in feeling is required: a decision to spare Lynceus is tantamount to a decision to effect his escape and ensure his safety. The onset of the fear described in this line (*timebam* is inceptive imperfect) is simply what hurries her along.

72 expulerunt:
The penult of this third person plural perfect tense scans, contrary to the more usual practice, as a short syllable. The device is common in epic (e.g. Virgil *Aen.* 2.774 *steterunt*, 3.681 *constiterunt*). Platnauer *LEV* 53 records sixteen incidences of this feature in Ovid; of the fifteen different verbs eleven, including *expulerunt*, could not occur in elegiacs if the penult scanned long. At each such occurrence in Ovid the pluperfect is offered as an alternative ms. reading. As Palmer on 7.166 notes, scribes were wont to alter the unfamiliar *-ĕrunt* to the pluperfect *erant*. However, the pluperfect may be used in place of an 'aorist' preterite (although not in place of a 'true perfect'), and could in some instances be the correct reading. See Housman (1922) 83–4. Thus either *expulerunt* or *expulerant* may be correct here.

somnos:
The plural might perhaps designate Lynceus' sleep as a pleasant state of blissful ignorance: see 11.31n. *somni*.

73–8:
These urgent words of warning to Lynceus engage systematically with the words of warning to Lynceus from Horace's Hypermestra:

'surge' quae dixit iuveni marito,
'surge, ne longus tibi somnus, unde
non times, detur; socerum et scelestas
falle sorores,

quae velut nactae vitulos leaenae
singulos eheu lacerant: ego illis
mollior nec te feriam neque intra
claustra tenebo.

me pater saevis oneret catenis,
quod viro clemens misero peperci,
me vel extremos Numidarum in agros
classe releget:

i pedes quo te rapiunt et aurae,
dum favet nox et Venus, i secundo
omine et nostri memorem sepulcro
scalpe querelam.'

(Horace *Carm.* 3.11.37–52).

The allusion is marked immediately. *haec mea dicta*, 'These things I said', hints at an intertext (on the 'Alexandrian footnote' and its variants, see 11.1–2n.); and the first word of both speeches is the same (*surge*, Horace 37, Ovid 73). In Horace, *surge* is repeated (38, at line beginning); not so in Ovid, but the intensity of the command is conveyed instead with the urgent *age*. This is typical of Ovid's general approach to the Horace in this passage: the four-stanza-long address of Horace's Hypermestra is slimmed down and compressed into an urgent and 'realistic' utterance. Ovid's epistolary form allows inclusion and manipulation of other Horatian details in the main body of the epistle (Horace 42–8 at 3; 45–8 at 9–11; 39 at 15: see nn.). Ovid breaks up the utterance with narrative (75–7), showing us what Horace does not—Lynceus' reaction.

Ovid's attempt to compete with Horace on his own terms can be seen in two specific details.

(i). Ovid 73–4 *versus* Horace 37–9. Horace's Hypermestra breaks the news to Lynceus with a common trope—death as sleep, a grimly appropriate statement with which to awaken him; note the allusive irony of *unde/non times*. Ovid's Hypermestra is shockingly blunt (73, a phrase cleverly re-used at 1, see n.): '. . . a horrifyingly brilliant way of having Hypermestra tell Lynceus what has happened' (Jacobson (1974) 127). Horace's 'death as sleep' is in Ovid 'death as night' (74)—an equally frequent commonplace (e.g. *Her.* 10.112, in the context of sleeping, as here, with Knox *ad loc.*), but one that allows Ovid

to play with another trope, the erotic importance of night (*OLD* s.v. *nox* 3c, 'a night's lovemaking . . .'; cf. Callimachus *Aetia* 3.75.44–8). 74 *ista*, dismissed by Palmer as simply = 'this' (*OLD* s.v. *iste* 4), marks out the tropes (*OLD* s.v. *iste* 3, '(of persons or things merely presented to the mind of the hearer) That which you have heard of or know to be such, the well-known, etc.'). Taken with *nox, ista* alludes to the importance of the wedding-night to the groom: 'That famous night of yours will be everlasting'. *ista* might also be taken with *perennis*—'. . . will be that famous everlasting one', with perhaps a specific nod to Catullus' *nox . . . perpetua* (5.6). Ovid's *nox perennis* produces an etymological oxymoron—'a year-long night'. Like Propertius at 3.20.13–4, *primae data tempora noctis!/ longius in primo, Luna, morare toro,* the groom might well desire the *nox prima* to exceed its natural length; but not even he would desire a *nox perennis.*

(ii). Ovid 77–8 *versus* Horace 50. Both Hypermestras warn Lynceus to flee while circumstances allow: *dum favet nox et Venus* in Horace, *dum nox sinit* in Ovid. Ovid's Hypermestra, as we would now expect, coyly omits the reference to love (*Venus*); but in so doing she omits a hint at better things to come: for the version of the myth where Aphrodite intervenes to save Hypermestra, see 4n. and 15n. *paeniteat.*

73 Belide:

Vocative of *Belides*, 'Descendant of Belus'. *Belīdes* is a false form, as Housman (1899) 177 chastizes Palmer for omitting to notice. The name of Lynceus' grandfather is not Beleus, but Belus (e.g. Aeschylus *Supp.* 319, and frequently elsewhere). See Austin (1955) on Virgil *Aen.* 2.82, and note besides that the form occurs first in Cinna, *iam inde a Belīdis . . .* (*FLP* 13). Such 'false' patronymics are common: see Housman loc. cit. for other examples. For the jingle *Beli<u>de</u> <u>de</u>*, cf. 11.18n. *possid<u>et</u> <u>et</u>.*

unus:

Probably vocative, in apposition with *Belide* (or even agreeing with it—'One Belides from what were just now so many brothers') rather than nominative, 'Rise as one from . . .'; but I have found no parallel for *unus* as vocative form: *une* is found at e.g. Catullus 37.17, and is given as the sole form of the vocative when Varro declines *unus* at *L.* 8.63. At any rate, *Belide* and *unus* are closely linked, even if not grammatically: Lynceus is the only surviving *Belides.*

74 ni properas . . . erit:
The construction is *nisi/ni* + present indicative + future indicative as a threat or warning, H-S 660. H.D. Naylor (1907) 44 compares the Greek εἰ + future indicative.

75–6:
Lynceus is taken from sleep, through the terror of being suddenly wakened, to the truly terrible nature of his surroundings, in a single couplet. Three present-tense verbs in asyndeton vividly describe Lynceus' abrupt waking process. *exsurgis* (more energetic than the *surgis*, 73, that was demanded of him) and *fugit*, and with them the actions they represent, follow on immediately the one from the other; the three sentences are in ascending tricolon, culminating in the unpleasant revelation of the pentameter.

75 fugit omnis inertia somni:
Circumstances dictate that Lynceus pass instantly from sleep to wakefulness, with no intermediate lethargy. For *inertia* of sleep cf. [Virgil] *Culex* 385 *inertia vitae*; but the usual pejorative sense of *inertia* (*OLD* s.v. *inertia* 2) may be felt: Lynceus' *inertia* during the last thirty or more lines contrasts with the life-or-death decision Hypermestra has had to make; cf. the implicit contrast between Lynceus' hand and Hypermestra's, 69–70n. A reader now conditioned to look for sexual undertones (37–8n., 42n., 55n.) might wish to scrutinize *inertia* further (*OLD* s.v. *iners* 5d, 'having no sexual capacity, impotent'; cf. 13.43–4n., on *iners*).

76 in timida fortia tela manu:
Chiasmus places the sword in the hand. Note in *timida fortia* the juxtaposition of opposites: the variant *tremula* recorded by Burman would lessen that effect. The inconspicuous personification of *timida . . . manu* is a coda to the crucial role of the hand in preventing the murder.

77–8:
Punctuation is difficult. The majority of editors place speech-marks around only 77 *dum nox sinit effuge*: 'You asked me for an explanation, and I replied "Flee while night allows!"/While black night allows, you flee and I remain.' Riese, Sedlmayer and Dörrie follow Merkel in making both *dum nox sinit effuge* and the whole of the pentameter 78 Hypermestra's spoken words: 'You asked me for an expla-

nation, and I replied "Flee while night allows;/while black night allows, flee, and I'll stay behind."' Both interpretations are possible. In the former, the spoken phrase is picked up by the narrator's comment in the pentameter; *fugis* and *moror* are 'historic' present-tenses, describing the situation as Hypermestra waits for morning. In the latter, Hypermestra restates and expands her plea; the repetition of *dum nox sinit* adds urgent emphasis, and the addition of *atra* is a persuasive detail—she exhorts Lynceus to flee while the blackness will conceal his movements. *tu fugis, ipsa moror*, taken as part of the direct speech, is an urgent command: present indicative for imperative (*fugis*) and present indicative for future indicative (*moror*) are both idioms conveying urgency (H-S 308, 326–7). I err towards Merkel's punctuation, but am uncertain whether any reader can be expected to punctuate with confidence.

Palmer's punctuation, which includes in direct speech *dum nox sinit effuge* and *dum nox atra sinit* but excludes *tu fugis ipsa moror*, is clumsy, and stems from an inability to make sense of Merkel's punctuation ('Merkel strangely makes [Hypermestra's spoken words] go on to *moror*.').

77 quaerenti causam:
As well he might. Hypermestra ignores the awkward question, instead urging flight.

78 tu fugis, ipsa moror:
For another version of the flight of Lynceus from the wedding-chamber, see Pausanias 2.25.4:

> ἐς τοῦτο λέγεται τὸ χωρίον Λυγκέα ἀποσωθῆναι τῶν πεντήκοντα ἀδελφῶν μόνον· καὶ ἡνίκα ἐσώθη, πυρσὸν ἀνέσχεν ἐντεῦθεν. συνέκειτο δὲ ἄρα αὐτῶι πρὸς τὴν Ὑπερμήστραν ἀνασχεῖν τὸν πυρσόν, ἣν διαφυγὼν Δαναὸν ἐς ἀσφαλὲς ἀφίκηταί ποι·

As she writes, this is the last time she saw Lynceus. He now leaves her field of vision—and ours too. Most extant versions of the myth are vague about what happens to Lynceus after he leaves the wedding-chamber, although all seem to assume his eventual survival (cf. intro.). Two fragments from *Lynceus*, a lost play by Theodectes (4th century B.C.), preserved in Aristotle's *Poetics* (see *TrGF* 3a), seem to suggest Lynceus' capture by Danaus before his eventual vindication (Bonner (1902) 160). Ovid's epistolary form allows him to avoid the details of Lynceus subsequent escape or capture.

79–80:
Hypermestra's narrative moves from *nox* (78) to *mane* (79). As she suspected (71), morning brings the presence of her father—in person, not through *famuli*—to ensure that his orders have been carried out. Ovid's Danaus is the prime mover, and the plan is his. He shares this trait with the Danaus of Aeschylus *Supplices* ('. . . he is βούλαρχος, πεσσονομῶν—planning his moves, playing his cards', Winnington-Ingram (1961) 145). Ovid puts his own stamp on this characterisation by means of a sustained metaphor (80–1n.).

Aeschylus may have depicted in his *Danaides* a similar scene to that depicted here: Danaus arriving in his daughters' bedrooms to check that all his son-in-laws are dead. Aeschylus *TrGF* fr. 43, it has been argued, comes from such a scene:

> κἄπειτα δ' εὖτε λαμπρὸν ἡλίου φάος
> ἕως ἐγείρῃ, πρευμενεῖς τοὺς νυμφίους
> νόμοισι θέντων σὺν κόροις τε καὶ κόραις

See F.G. Welcker (1824), and Winnington-Ingram (1961) 148, who nevertheless remarks that 'both text and interpretation are doubtful.'

79 mane erat et:
Cf. 12.64, Propertius 2.29.23, and the common phrase *nox erat et* (famously at Virgil *Aen.* 4.522). Bessone (1997) on 12.64 (62 her numbering) remarks on the relatively humble style of the formula *mane erat.*

ex caede iacentes:
The morning call is paid to grooms lying (*iacentes*), not in sleep, but, as the grim *ex caede* makes clear, in death. *ex caede* has both a temporal (*OLD* s.v. *ex* 10) and a causal sense (*OLD* ibid. 8). The expression is not as strange as 2 *crimine iacere* (n.), but the scribes apparently found it awkward: Dörrie records the variants *ex caede recentes, madentes, nocentes* and *centos* (this last prompted no doubt by the arithmetical considerations that follow, 80ff.).

80–1: dinumerat. summae . . . unus . . . iacturam . . . in uno:
The scheming character of Danaus (see on 79–80) and his desire to check whether the pre-arranged murders have taken place (cf. Pausanias 2.24.2, quoted under 5n. *iugulo demittere ferrum,* where the Danaids hold up the severed heads of their grooms for Danaus to see) find expression in an extended accounting metaphor. Danaus is cold

and—literally—calculating. He counts out the corpses like a man counting out the money he is owed (*OLD* s.v. *dinumero* 1b); but there is a shortfall (*OLD* s.v. *iactura* 6) from the agreed amount (*OLD* s.v. *summa* 1b) by one unit (*unus, in uno*—a nice development of the 'Lynceus as *unus*' motif, on which see 1n. *de tot modo fratribus uni*).

iactura contributes to the metaphor; but since it can itself be used to describe a death (deaths) in the family (*TLL* 63.57ff.; cf. the English 'loss'), the phrase *iactura mortis*, 'the loss of a death', has a paradoxical ring. The phraseology may have been suggested by Virgil's *facilis iactura sepulcri, Aen.* 2.646, 'famous and arresting words' (Austin (1964) *ad loc.*). The original sense of *iactura*—a technical term for the jettisoning of items from a boat in trouble at sea—is elsewhere exploited by Ovid (see e.g. McKeown (1998) on *Am.* 2.11.35), but probably not felt here, despite Danaus' nautical connections (for Danaus as the sailor of the first pentekonter, see Hyginus *Fab.* 168, Pseudo-Apollodorus *Bib.* 2.1.4, Schol. Statius *Theb.* 2.222, Schol. Aeschylus *Prom.* 853ff.).

81 *in uno* = 'in one unit', 'to the value of one'; this use of *in* is comprehensible, but I have found similar usages only in late Latin (cf. e.g. *TLL* s.v. *in* 793.69ff. 'pro abl. pretii').

80 abest:
abest, a minor variant, is preferable to the majority reading *abes*. The second-person jumps the gun. The verse describes Danaus' realisation that one corpse is missing; here, and in the couplet that follows, he is not yet concerned with its identity. The simple procedure which would lead to the identification of the culprit is not narrated; but at line 83 the scene 'cuts' to the point when Danaus has made his discovery.

81 cognatae . . . mortis:
The dead sons of Aegyptus are Danaus' *cognati* on two counts: by birth and now by marriage.

82 pacti sanguinis:
The accounting metaphor (80-1n.) continues in 82 if one accepts E.L.B. Meurig Davies' conjecture *pacti* ((1949) 76). The mss. give *facti* ('bloodshed'), somewhat banal. Housman's conjecture *sacri*, 'blood whose shedding is an abomination' ((1897a) 288), is a fine phrase, and he supports it with parallels for this use of *sacer* and with a

palaeographical argument; but the phrase has to represent (albeit in indirect speech) part of Danaus' complaint, and Danaus would hardly call *sacer* the blood of his enemies. Reading *pacti*, Danaus complains that the blood falls short of the agreed amount (*TLL* s.v. *pango* 206.41). There may also be a grim pun on the wedding contract (*TLL* s.v. *pango* 206.82).

83 abstrahor ab patriis pedibus:
'Scaliger wrote Λείπει against this verse; but the abruptness is poetic' (Palmer *ad loc.*). Hypermestra need only say that she is hauled from her father's feet in order for the reader to know that she flung herself there. Nevertheless, this may be another example of Hypermestra's careful editing of her epistle. The usual reason for lying prostrate at the feet of another is to beg for mercy or forgiveness ('*a patriis pedibus* "from my father's feet," at which I had thrown myself as a suppliant', Shuckburgh *ad loc.*). Presentation of herself as suppliant to her father would undermine both her claim to *pietas* (as she herself states at 13–4) and her appeal to Lynceus.

raptamque capillis:
Hypermestra presents Danaus' treatment of her as particularly brutal. Being dragged by the hair is a suitable punishment for tragic heroines, such as Antiope (Pacuvius *Antiopa ROL* 19 *tractate per aspera saxa et humum*). Compare Cassandra's treatment at the hands of the Greeks, as depicted in art and perhaps also at Virgil *Aen.* 2.403–4 *ecce trahebatur passis Priameia virgo/crinibus* (*passis . . . crinibus* ablative of instrument); and Galanthis' at the hands of Lucina at *Met.* 9.317–8 *ipsis dea saeva capillis/traxit.*

84 haec meruit pietas praemia:
Not a question, as Dörrie wishes, but an ironical statement. For this ironical use of *praemia* see *OLD* s.v. *praemium* 2c.

85–108:
Hypermestra considers the plight of her ancestress Io (see Palmer on 23 for the genealogy), beloved of Jupiter, transformed into a heifer and eventually back to a human and then to a goddess.

'J.C. Scaliger and D. Heinsius were the first of many to question either the authenticity or the place of these lines' (Jacobson (1974) 134), including, it seems, Dörrie, who, by recording in his appara-

tus the fact that the passage had been suspected, broke with his own principle, set out on pp. 8–9 of his edition (cf. Reeve (1974) 63). The lines should undoubtedly be kept. This is a fine example of a familiar myth being recast by an Ovidian heroine.

Io was popular with the Latin poets: Propertius refers to her frequently, notably at 2.33; and Ovid returns to her in detail at *Met.* 1.588–750, an overtly humorous account that reworks and develops many of the themes and phraseology found in our passage (e.g. 89n., 91n., 91n. *conatoque queri*, 94n.). This popularity will almost certainly owe something to Calvus' lost *Io*: even the six surviving fragments from the poem (*FLP* 9–14) can be seen to exert their influence (see on 93 *infelix*, 96), and one can speculate that such influence would be seen to be extensive had the work survived (see on 90 *cornua . . . non sua*, 91, 101–2, 105 *Inachi*). Hypermestra's depiction of the dual identity of Io's post-metamorphosis state (see on 90 *cornua . . . non sua*, 92, 96) foreshadows some of the ways in which metamorphoses are depicted in *Met.* (on which see Hollis (1970) xixff.)

A character's use of mythological *exempla* to postulate a family curse is a common device in tragedy; and in linking the Io and Danaid myths, Ovid has good precedent. In Aeschylus *Prom.*, Io learns of the Danaids from the prophetic Prometheus; and in *Supp.*, the Danaids, like Hypermestra here, muse on the career of their ancestress. The connection may in fact go back further than Aeschylus (Garvie (1969) 174, 178).

Ovid's Hypermestra offers no empty retelling of the story. Rather, she acts as poet, sorting and shifting the mythological material. This Io arises out of Hypermestra's own experience, and her condition is allegorically linked to Hypermestra's. Cf. Jacobson (1974) 134–5. Various echoes connect the *Iosage* to Hypermestra's narration about herself: 88n. *modo*, 89–90n. *parentis . . . patriis*, 91n. *conatoque queri*, 92n., 93n. *infelix*, 94n., 95n., 98n., 100n. *dives*, 101n. *cognataque flumina*, 103n. *causa fugae*, 104n. *effugere*, 105n. *Inachis*. These echoes do not simply portray the two heroines as acting in an identical manner; rather, phrases, ideas and sounds from all over Hypermestra's narrative reappear here, giving the impression that Io is being created out of the whole of Hypermestra's experience.

The result is an Io in which Hypermestra becomes emotionally involved. The account is a vivid one: note the use of apostrophe (cf. 93n. *infelix*), interjection (103n. *io*), 'historic' present-tenses, and metrical effects (105–6n.). Jacobson (1974) 134 sees the passage as 'a vicarious psychological outlet' (cf. 360–1).

But, moreoever, it presents an allegorical message aimed at Lynceus, of whose feelings Hypermestra is unsure. Hypermestra selects her material to produce an Io who is unlike Inachus her father (89n.), and who is wretched because she has lost favour with her lover (88, 99–100) through the anger of a third party (87n.). Will Lynceus see the similarity with Hypermestra, and complete the analogy by supplying for Hypermestra a happy outcome, to match the happy outcome for Io that Hypermestra coyly mentions in passing (86n., 109–10n.)?

Io as allegory for Hypermestra may be a development of a theme in Aeschylus' Danaid trilogy. R.D. Murray Jr. (1958) argues for a similar use of the Io myth there. He notes that in the *Supplices* 'the Danaids' atavistic obsession that they are, in some sense, a reincarnation of Io, is a determining and dominant element of their character. Yet their perception of similarity between themselves and Io is woefully limited and superficial' (p. 69), and speculates that in the lost resolution of the trilogy Hypermestra emerged as 'the new Io' (p. 86).

85:
Hypermestra explains the cause of her present suffering in the manner of Hellenistic aetiological verse: for the formula *scilicet ex illo . . . manet,* cf. *Ars* 1.133–4 with Hollis (1977) *ad loc.* The anger of Juno is a commonplace (cf. e.g. 9.45–6); and the Virgilian phrasing *Iunonia . . . ira* (*Aen.* 1.671–2 *Iunonia . . . hospitia*) may make the reader think of perhaps the most famous instance (Virgil *Aeneid, passim*); on the lofty tone of such adjectival formations as *Iunonia,* see McKeown (1989) on *Am.* 1.13.23 and (1998) on 2.6.55–6.

The Danaids of Aeschylus' *Supplices* also connected their sufferings with Hera's continuing anger:

> ἆ Ζήν· Ἰοῦς ἰὼ μῆνις
> μάστειρ' ἐκ θεῶν· κοννῶ δ' ἄγαν
> γαμετ-ᾶς Διὸς οὐρανονίκου.
> χαλεποῦ γὰρ ἐκ πνεύματος εἶσι χειμών.
>
> (*Supp.* 163–6)

With *scilicet,* = 'as everybody knows', Ovid signals the intertext: for *scilicet* as a 'telltale adverb', see Kenney (1990) 23. *permanet,* expressing longer endurance than simply *manet,* is likewise a wink to the reader: the μῆνις which pursued Aeschylus' Danaids still holds good in Ovid.

85–6 ex illo . . . quo:
'from the time . . . when'. 'This seems a unique instance of *quo* referring to *tempore* contained in *illo*, but it may be sound for all that' (Palmer *ad loc.*). *tempore*, or perhaps *die*, is readily supplied with both *illo* and *quo*. There is no need to accept Madvig's emendation *ex illo . . . cum*. Palmer's tentative suggestions *quae bos ex homine* and *ex quo bos homine* are both faulty: it is extremely doubtful whether *ira, quae* might stand for *ira contra eam, quae*, and at any rate *ex illo* requires an answering temporal clause; and *ex quo bos homine* ignores the demands of sense, which require '(from the time) at which', not 'from which'.

86:
This succinct account of Io's career evidently pleased Ovid: the line recurs, with a minor syntactical change, at *Fast.* 5.620 *quae bos ex homine est, ex bove facta dea*. For O's reuse of his own lines, see on 1 *de tot modo fratribus uni*. In our passage the brevity has point: Io's eventual deification as Isis (for which cf. e.g. *Met.* 1.747) is passed over in four words (*ex bove facta dea*); for Hypermestra's suppression of the happy ending to Io's story, see 109–10n.

ex bove:
de bove, a ms. reading noted and supplied with parallels by Burman, spoils the symmetry with *ex homine*.

dea:
For -ă at pentameter ending, see 14n.

87 poenae:
According to Hypermestra, Io's transformation was a punishment from Juno. According to the more common account, Jupiter himself transformed Io in order to avoid detection: see e.g. Hesiod *Inachi Progenies* fr. 124 Merkelbach-West = Pseudo-Apollodorus *Bib.* 2.1.3, Ovid *Met.* 1.610ff. But Hypermestra's claim is not without precedent: Aeschylus' Danaids blamed Juno for the metamorphosis, *Supp.* 299 βοῦν τὴν γυναῖκ' ἔθηκεν Ἀργεία θεός; cf. Propertius 2.33.9–10 *cum te iussit habere puellam cornua Iuno/et pecoris duro perdere verba sono*, 3.22.35–6 *cornua nec valuit* [in Rome] *curvare in paelice Iuno/aut faciem turpi dedecorare bove*. Hypermestra selects the version of the myth that best reflects her own situation: like Io, Hypermestra has, she fears,

lost her lover's favour because of the anger of a third party (Juno and Danaus respectively).

teneram mugisse puellam:
The phrase encapsulates Io's plight. The juxtaposition *mugisse puellam* points out the paradox; the juxtaposition *teneram mugisse* produces the onomatopoeic *m mu* (Quintilian 12.10.31 *quid quod pleraque nos illa quasi mugiente [m] littera cludimus*). *teneram* does not simply form a contrast with *mugisse*: *tener* may designate not only attractive young women, but also skittish animals (e.g. *Her.* 4.21 *teneros . . . iuvencos*); the word also signals that the story is an elegiac one (*OLD* s.v. *tener* 6 '(of persons, their affections or expressions of them, etc.) Tender, sensitive. b (w. ref. to sexual love, love poetry, etc.)'), and therefore suitable for inclusion in an elegiac epistle.

As the elder Pliny notes (*Nat.* 8.183), a common portent among the ancients was a talking cow (e.g. Livy 24.10.10 *bovem in Sicilia locutum*); Ovid here presents us with a mooing girl. Cf. 91n.

88:
Once transformed, Io is attractive to Jupiter no longer. In other versions of the myth, Io is attractive even as a cow: *Met.* 1.612 *bos quoque formosa est*, Lucian *D.Mar.* 11 (7) νῦν δὲ ἔτι ἐρᾷ τῆς βοός/καὶ μάλα . . .; cf. Hesiod *Inachi Progenies* fr. 124 Merkelbach-West leuvkhn, Valerius Flaccus 4.380 *candentes armos*. Aeschylus' Danaids too assert that Zeus, in the form of a bull, made love to Io after her transformation (Martial 14.180 *Europe picta: mutari melius tauro, pater optime divum,/tunc poteras, Io cum tibi vacca fuit* seems to be unaware of this version). In Hypermestra's account, the detail of Io as unattractive cow, perhaps drawing on Propertius 3.22.35–6 *Iuno . . . faciem turpi dedecorare bove*, stresses Io's cruel fate, and suggests an analogy with Hypermestra's own: she is unsure whether she is still attractive to Lynceus.

modo formosam:
Hypermestra's use of *modo* + adjective in connection with Io here and at 99–100 *modo . . . dives* echoes its use in connection with Lynceus at 1 (n.) and 73: her own situation and that of her family prompts her to see Io's predicament as a sudden reversal of fortunes.

89:
Cf. *Met.* 1.639–40 *venit et ad ripas, ubi ludere saepe solebat,/Inachidas ripas.*

liquidi nova vacca parentis:
Chiasmus juxtaposes father and daughter and their respective peculiar epithets. The river-god Inachus is a watery parent, at one and the same time Io's father and a river at whose bank she can stand. Ovid enjoys playing with the dual nature of water deities: cf. e.g. the conceit whereby the god increases his own waters with his tears, of Inachus at *Met.* 1.584 *fletibus auget aquas.* Io is a recently metamorphosed cow, *nova vacca, OLD* s.v. *novus* 15 'That has recently become (a person of the status, relationship, etc., named)'; cf. *Met.* 1.640–1 *novaque . . . cornua.* Father and daughter make a strange pair—perhaps, Hypermestra would wish Lynceus to think, like Hypermestra and Danaus? The heroine's plea to Lynceus relies on persuading him that her loyalties are to him rather than to her father.

89–90 parentis . . . patriis:
The strong paternal influence on Hypermestra (see on 9 *pater*) is reflected here.

90 cornua . . . non sua:
The first features of her new appearance that Io notices are her horns. They are regularly a shorthand for her bovine form: *Am.* 1.3.21 *carmine nomen habent exterrita cornibus Io, Met.* 1.640–1 *novaque ut conspexit in unda/cornua*, Propertius 2.33.9 and 3.22.35–6, quoted under 87n. *poenae*; cf. 2.28.17 *Io versa caput primos mugiverat annos.* This may stem ultimately (perhaps via Calvus) from the representation of Io in Aeschylus *Prom.*, where references to her bovine appearance are references to her horns (588 and 674), probably reflecting a horned mask worn by the actor on stage (M. Griffith (1983) on *Prom.* 588). In our line the horns are *non sua, OLD* s.v. *suus* 8a '(esp. poet. of features of the body, etc.) Belonging to him at birth or naturally (and not adventitious or sim.)', an expression of Io's dual identity: her 'self' is human, her body bovine. Cf. *Met.* 3.202–3 *lacrimaeque per ora/non sua fluxerunt* of the stag-man Actaeon.

91:
The Io of Aeschylus *Prom.* was able to articulate herself quite clearly (although her utterances are punctuated with cries of pain), and in Aeschylus *Supp.* no mention is made of whether she can speak or not. Her inability here to make any sound other than a mooing may come from Calvus; cf. Propertius 2.33.9–10 (quoted under 87n. *poenae*)

and 2.28.17 (quoted under 90n.), where the motif is paired with mention of her horns, as here; Ovid elaborates the motif at *Met.* 1.646ff., where the dumb Io, unable to explain her predicament to Inachus, resorts to writing in the dust with her hoof.

conatoque queri:
The mss. produce an array of alternatives for *conatoque*: the choice which an editor must make amounts to one between *conatoque* and *et conata*. And the editor must also choose between *loqui* and *queri*, both ms. readings. The same two choices must be made at *Met.* 1.637 (of Io) *conatoque* [or *et conata*] *loqui* [or *queri*] *mugitus edidit ore*, and made independently: the two lines may either be identical, *pace* Bömer (1969–1986) there, or not. On self-quotation in Ovid, see 1n. *de tot modo fratribus uni*.

In our passage, *conatoque* has the advantage that in 89–92 each line that describes a further stage in the process of Io's discovery of her own metamorphosis is tagged-on to the last with the connective *-que*, effectively conveying the breathless involvement of the narrator.

At *Met.* 1.637, *queri* has particular point, given that the context is Io's pleas for mercy directed at her guard Argus. In our line, *loqui*, = 'speak with human voice', would contrast well with *mugitus*. But *queri* would well describe Io's reaction to seeing her horns, and *conatoque queri* would mimic the sound of lament and constitute a further echo of Hypermestra's earlier narrative (67n.). *conatoque queri* also has the advantage of producing an explanation for the various ms. readings—haplography (see Heinsius on the 'oscitantia librariorum'; and cf. 67 where 3 mss. give *dum queror* for *dumque queror* and one other strikes out *-que* after writing it); but such an explanation may not be necessary, since *loqui* and *queri* are readily confused (e.g. *Her.* 18.82). On balance, I favour *conatoque queri*.

92:
Io is terrified by her own metamorphosis—a common motif in poetic accounts of transformations (R.O.A.M. Lyne (1978) on *Ciris* 48), and developed in particular in Ovid *Met.* (of Io at *Am.* 1.3.21, *Met.* 1.638 and 641). Io's dual identity is here conveyed in a manner opposite to that at 90: there, she saw horns that did not belong to her (*non sua*); here, she is terrified by her own voice and appearance (*sua*).

Io's fear may compliment Hypermestra's; but the verbal echo is to Lynceus', 92 *territaque*, 75 *territus*, both at line beginning.

93 quid furis:

Heinsius takes *furis* to refer to Io's οἰστρηλασία, the madness inflicted on her in the form of a gad-fly by Juno (Aeschylus *Prom.* 877–93, *Supp.* 538ff., Ovid *Met.* 1.724ff.). Damsté (1905) 44 goes further: such a reference, he claims, and hence the couplet 93–4, belongs between 100 and 101. It may be true that mention of the gad-fly, if made at all, would best be made at that point: the onset of Io's madness is regularly connected with the start of her wanderings. But Hypermestra does not specify Io's madness as οἰστρηλασία, and indeed *quid furis?* would be a strange way to refer to it: after all, the victim of a divine-sent madness has little choice but to *furere.* Ovid has incorporated the οἰστρηλασία, but has adapted it to describe Io's reasonable reaction to her transformation. Cf. 108 *insanae,* and Calvus *FLP* 10 *mens mea, dira sibi praedicens omnia, vecors,* context unknown, but probably spoken by Io herself.

The ms. reading *fugis* is worth considering: Io flees from her reflection and from her lowing, as at *Met.* 1.641, but is then drawn back by curiosity to examine herself in the water (*quid te miraris in unda?*).

infelix:

infelix of Io (cf. *Met.* 1.634) alludes to Calvus' famous *a virgo infelix, herbis pasceris amaris* (*FLP* 9). In Calvus, it was probably the omnipotent narrator that addressed her thus; in our line it is Hypermestra, and the 'highly charged apostrophe' (Jacobson (1974) 93) with ascending tricolon (93–4) conveys Hypermestra's emotional involvement in a fate she considers similar to her own (122 *infelix* of herself).

quid te miraris in unda:

Io gazes in amazement at her reflection in the water. Ovid further explores the motif of amazement at reflections in the *Metamorphoses* (*Met.* 1.640–1 of Io; cf. Bömer (1969–1986) on Met. 3.200).

in umbra is read by the first hand of P and by one other ms. Heinsius, and Palmer tentatively, accept *in umbra* with reference to Io's shadow on the ground, because they dislike the repetition of ideas entailed in the paradosis *in unda* (cf. 90 *in . . . aquis*). Cf. Bornecque-Prévost, who print *in umbra* and translate 'pourquoi t'étonner de ton ombre'. But the repeated idea of returning to water (90, 93, 97) effectively conveys Io's amazement at her new form, and is well expressed: Ovid takes care to avoid repetition of words and sentence

formation: note the varying expressions describing both the act of looking and the water, 90 *vidit*, 93 *miraris*, 97 *spectas*, 90 *aquis*, 93 *unda*, 97 *fonte*.

in unda, then, is fine; but *in umbra* is nevertheless a possibility. Some editors print it with reference to the reflection in water: Showerman-Goold 'Why gaze at thyself in the water's shadow', Shuckburgh '"in your shadow" i.e. reflected in the water'. For *umbra* in this sense, cf. Pliny *Nat.* 33.130 *neque enim est aliud illa imago* [image in a mirror] *quam digesta claritate materiae accipientis umbra*, and D.R.S. Bailey (1956) 86, '. . . In one of these [senses] *umbra* means a reflection in water'. In Ovid, cf. *Met.* 3.434 [Narcissus] *ista repercussae, quam cernis, imaginis umbra est*; 4.712–3 [the serpent and Perseus] *ut in aequore summo/umbra viri visa est, visa fera saevit in umbra*; and perhaps also 3.417 [Narcissus] *corpus putat esse, quod unda est*—some mss. read *umbra est*. In the context of looking at a reflection in water, there is little to choose between *in unda* and *in umbra*, whether they both occur in the mss., as in our line, or not, as at *Met.* 1.640, 3.200, 3.486, 15.565.

94:

Consideration of number and type of feet becomes a motif of animal transformations in *Met.*: e.g. 1.744 of Io restored to human form, *officioque pedum nymphe contenta duorum*; 4.592 *Cadme quid hoc? ubi pes?*; 9.319 of Galanthis, *inque pedes mutavit bracchia primos*. In our line, it is expressed in terms that recall Hypermestra's account of herself: with *factos ad* cf. 56 *faciunt . . . ad*: 'Io is puzzled and terrified by her new state (91–4), just as Hypermestra is horrified by the strangeness of hers (55–6 . . .)', Jacobson (1974) 135. But this is not straightforward identification of Hypermestra with Io. *numeras* recalls Danaus' actions at 80 (*dinumerat*): Danaus counted out his dead sons-in-law and found one lacking; Io counts her feet and finds two more than she expected.

95:

'You, that (in)famous mistress of great Jupiter, a source of alarm to his sister. . . .' The grand vocative phrase (note esp. the grandeur of *Iovis magni*) stands in stark contrast to the undignified and inhuman activity described in the pentameter. *illa* draws attention to Io's fame (Palmer *ad loc.*; cf. 13.14n. *illud . . . triste vale*, and 74 *ista* with 73–8n.), and functions on two levels: Io is well-known not only to Hypermestra, through the stories told her by *cana senectus* (109), but also to Ovid's

reader: the fame of the story is stressed as early as Aeschylus (see e.g. *Supp.* 293 φάτις πολλὴ κρατεῖ, 295 μὴ καὶ λόγος τις Ζῆνα μειχθῆνα⟨ι⟩ βροτῷ). In particular, taken with *paelex*, *illa* draws attention to Io's fame as a mistress: Propertius 3.22.35 *paelice*; *Met.* 1.726 *paelicis Argolicae*; Valerius Flaccus 4.357 *paelex*.

sorori is a further reflection of the narrator: Hypermestra, who refers to herself as her husband's *soror* and to Lynceus as her *frater* (1n. *de tot modo fratribus uni*), names Juno, despite the erotic context, by reference to her sororal, not conjugal, relationship to Jupiter.

96:
Mention of Io's diet is a staple feature of the myth:

> ματέρος ἀνθονόμους ἐπωπάς,
> λειμῶνα βούχιλον
>
> (Aeschylus *Supp.* 539–40).

Latin poets were strongly influenced by Calvus in their expression of the motif:

> a virgo infelix, herbis pasceris amaris
>
> (Calvus *FLP* 9)

> a quotiens quernis laesisti frondibus ora,
> mandisti <et> stabulis arbuta pasta tuis!
>
> (Propertius 2.33.11–2)

> frondibus arboreis et amara pascitur herba
>
> (Ovid *Met.* 1.632).

All these use the theme to illustrate Io's double identity: only a cow that is also a girl would find grass *amarus*, and *frondes* don't harm the mouths of ordinary cattle. So here: only from a girl's perspective is a bovine appetite excessive (*nimiam*). Note that Calvus' *herba* has been increased here to *caespitibus*—clumps, or even fields, of turf (*TLL* s.v. *caespes* 112.13ff. 'campus gramineus').

Apuleius makes use of the corollary, that human food is no good for animals unless they are metamorphosed humans, at *Met.* 10.13.

97:
Reference to Io's drinking-water is attached to discussion of her food by the jingle *fronde . . . fronte*. For the cow-girl's source of water, cf. Propertius 2.28.18 *Nili flumina*, Valerius Flaccus 4.379 *lacus*. The motif here provides a further opportunity (cf. 90 and 93) to describe Io's

amazement, underlined by *stupefacta*, a word found in Ovid only here: as she drinks, she gazes astonished at her reflection.

98:
Io's fear and amazement at her horns (cf. 90n.) is here made more specific with *te ne feriant*: she is frightened of injuring herself. Hypermestra's phrasing, notably *geris arma*, again draws out the parallels with her own situation: 'Both heroines find themselves equipped with weapons unusual, indeed alien to themselves and are astonished (65–66, 98)', Jacobson (1974) 135. But whereas Io is afraid of accidentally wounding herself, Hypermestra was afraid of intentionally wounding someone else; it was Lynceus himself who nearly incurred accidental injury (70). For *arma* applied to the natural weaponry of animals, see *TLL* s.v. *arma* 601.52ff., *OLD* q.v. 8b.

et te ne:
Preferable to the *et ne te* read by some mss.: for hyperbaton involving delay of conjunction, see K-S 2.614f. Heinsius compares Virgil *Ecl.* 10.48 *a, te ne frigora laedant!*

99–100:
'And you recline naked on the naked soil, who were just now so rich that you were able to be deemed fit for Jupiter'—an expansion of the idea set out in 88, and a stark contrast between Io's pre- and post-metamorphosis states.

99 modo:
Cf. 1n. and 88n.

posses:
The majority of mss., including P, give *possis*. Better is the reading *posses*: the subjunctive in the consecutive clause is imperfect, because her days of attracting Jupiter are in the past.

Iove digna:
Io was once able to be deemed *Iove digna*: the phrase may be applied to women both actually (as here) and potentially fit for Jupiter: *Her.* 16.274 of Helen; Propertius 1.13.29, of Leda or Cynthia, depending on the text; 2.2.6 of Juno and by inference of the poet's beloved.

Ovid makes nice use of the phrase at *Met.* 1.589: Jupiter, not yet revealing his identity, deems Io worthy of himself. In our line, the pecuniary sense of *digna* (*OLD* s.v. *dignus* 3 '(w. abl. or gen.) Worth') is brought out by the context of wealth (100 *dives*).

100 dives:
A girl's wealth is not, to say the least, the usual criterion for her being considered *Iove digna*: the context of e.g. Propertius 1.13.29 (see previous n.) is Cynthia's seductive abilities. Io usually catches Jupiter's eye because of her beauty: Aeschylus *Prom.* 649–50 Ζεὺς γὰρ ἱμέρου βέλει/πρὸς σοῦ τέθαλπται καὶ συναίρεσθαι Κύπριν/θέλει, Lucian *D. Deor.* 7 (3) [Zeus to Hermes] τὴν τοῦ Ἰνάχου παῖδα τὴν καλὴν οἶσθα, ὦ Ἑρμῆ; Beauty is the reason that Hypermestra herself alludes to at 88. The peculiar idea in our line that Jupiter chooses his conquests for their personal wealth stems from Hypermestra's wish to see Io as similar to herself, and beauty in terms of financial riches: for Hypermestra as rich princess, see 51–2n.

nuda nuda recumbis humo:
Io's wretched state is conveyed by an effective pun on *nudus*: as an animal, she is naked—*nuda*, with undertones of poverty (*OLD* q.v. 1b and 10) that form a contrast with *dives*; and as a cow she sleeps on earth that is hard and bare, *nuda* (*OLD* q.v. 11). For Io's rough bed compare Met. 1.633–4 *proque toro terrae non semper gramen habenti/incubat infelix*. For pun and polyptoton of *nudus*, cf. Met. 4.261 *sedit humo nuda nudis incompta capillis* of Clytie, 7.183 *nuda pedem, nudos umeris infusa capillos* of Medea (cf. Wills (1996) 229); for examples with other words, see Ehwald (1900) 23.

101–7:
Housman (1897b) 288–9 considers 103 and 106 interpolations in a passage that originally ran 101, 102, 105, 104, 107. His objection to 103 centres on *io* and *freta longa pererras*, that to 106 on *tibi dux*. For defences of these lines, see nn. *ad loc.*

101–2:
The wanderings of Io are an integral part of the myth, and seem to have been present from an early stage. They are hinted at in the fragments of Hesiod's *Aegimius* (see e.g. D.J. Conacher (1980) 18),

and occur in Aeschylus *Supp.* (311ff.) and at length in *Prom.* (696–741, 782–822, 823–852). They are regularly mentioned by Latin authors: e.g. Calvus *FLP* 12 *frigida iam celeri superatur Bistonis ira* and 13 *sol quoque perpetuos meminit requiescere cursus,* Propertius 2.33.7–8, Ovid *Met.* 1.724–8. Commentators on Aeschylus *Prom.* have widely discussed the details of Io's route (e.g. Conacher 61–2, Griffith (1983) 213–4). Hypermestra gives no such details in her couplet-long account, but the repetitions *per . . . per, mare . . . mare, terras . . . terra,* and *dat . . . dant* convey something of the length of the arduous journey.

101 mare:
Sensibly unspecific. Griffith (1983) on Aeschylus *Prom.* 732–4, 'There were two straits known as Bosporus: one by Byzantium, at the south-west entrance to the Black Sea (Thracian B.), the other connecting the Black Sea with Lake Maeotis (Cimmerian B.). Most versions of the Io story have her crossing the more familiar Thracian Bosporus (as at Aesch. *Supp.* 544–5), but here [in the *Prometheus Bound*] once again the tradition is being altered or "corrected". . . .'

cognataque flumina:
The mythological detail that, as grandaughter of Ocean, all rivers are Io's aunts (Aesch. *Prom.* 636, where Prometheus bids Io oblige the chorus of Oceanids ἄλλως τε πάντως καὶ κασιγνήταις πατρός) is framed to suggest a further connection between Io and Hypermestra. Kinsmen feature largely in Hypermestra's account of herself: cf. especially 81 *cognatae mortis.*

103 causa fugae:
The spur to Io's wanderings is usually the gad-fly sent by Juno: see e.g. Aeschylus *Supp.* 306–8, *Prom.* 566, etc. In Hypermestra's account, the cause of Io's flight is insistently presented as a desire to escape herself, 104, 105, 106—the framing of the idea in three ways represents urgent involvement in Io's state of mind on Hypermestra's part, and a fine display of *variatio* on Ovid's. Hypermestra, who presented herself as an individual torn in two (53–66), readily presents Io as similarly divided. In so doing, she draws on the philosophical *topos* of the traveller unable to escape himself, on which see e.g. Horace *Carm.* 2.16.18–20, with Nisbet-Hubbard (1978) *ad loc.*: a common explanation for wanderlust is applied literally to the transformed Io. Cf. Scylla, the lower half of her body transformed into sea-monsters,

refugitque abigitque timetque/ora proterva canum, sed, quos fugit, attrahit una (*Met.* 14.62–3)

io:

This the paradosis has been rejected by the majority of editors, who take it to be the vocative of the heroine's name, *Io*, and as such unmetrical. *Io* always scans as a spondee. Appeals to *Ibis* 620 as an instance of *Io* with short *i* (so Egnatius, and some others after him) are in vain: the correct reading there is almost certainly *Ion* = 'Ionian'. In our line, conjectures have been made, including *quid iam* (Riese), *frustra* (Palmer (1891) 94), and *quid tu* (Ehwald).

An alternative approach, of which Egnatius was aware, is to print not *Io* but *io*, the interjection (so Dörrie), which fits the metre, whether it scans as an iamb, as regularly, or as a single long syllable, as at e.g. Catullus 61.117 (see Fordyce (1961) *ad loc.*). Housman (1897b) 288, who condemns 103 and 106 and transposes 104 and 105, finds this suggestion 'exquisitely absurd'; but in terming verses 93–106 'a purely formal apostrophe to a long-departed ancestress', in which the vivid exclamation would be out of place, he misjudges the tone (see on 85–108). Moreover, *io* engages with an intertext. At Aeschylus *Supp.* 162–3 ἆ Ζῆν· Ἰοῦς, ἰώ,/μῆνις μάστειρ' ἐκ θεῶν the name and the interjection are juxtaposed, perhaps as an etymological jingle: 'Io's name is ominously associated with, if not derived from, a cry of lamentation', Johansen-Whittle (1980) 2.132. Ovid uses only the interjection, but with an inescapable reference to the name of the girl to whom it is addressed. Cf. G. Lee (1953) on *Met.* 1.650 *triste*, which he suggests may refer to Io's plaintive name.

freta longa pererras:

'Has anyone ever asked himself what *freta longa pererrare* means? It describes very well the wanderings of Ulysses, but we are talking about Io: in what human tongue does *freta longa pererrare* signify to swim the Bosporus?', Housman (1897b) 288. But Hypermestra is keen to stress the length and erratic nature of the crossing, and in that context *freta longa pererrare* is ideal. For *pererrare* of journeys over water, cf. *Am.* 3.13.33–4, *Fast.* 4.498, and *Met.* 7.460.

104 effugere:

effugere = 'escape' as opposed to *fugere* = 'run away from' (103 *fugae*, 105 *fugis*). The contrast is a natural one given the context (cf. e.g.

Lucretius 3.1068–9 *hoc se quisque modo* ***fugit****, at quem scilicet, ut fit,/* ***effugere*** *haut potis est: ingratius haeret et odit*, of human restlessness) but there is perhaps an echo of a detail in Hypermestra's own story (77–8 *effuge . . . fugis*).

Ovid clearly felt no compunction against elision at this *sedes* in the pentameter. Platnauer *LEV* 89 counts in Ovid 35 instances, nearly all elision of final short -e, compared with 12 in Propertius and none in Tibullus.

105–6:
On the dactylic couplet with mid-line sense-pause in the hexameter, see on 21.

105 Inachi:
Hypermestra addresses her ancestress with a term that asserts their kinship: she too is *Inachis* (cf. 23 *Inachides*). The patronymic is first attested in Greek at Moschus *Europa* 44 Ἰναχὶς Ἰώ. The earliest extant occurrences of *Inachis* substantive, as here (= 'daughter of Inachus') are Propertius 1.3.20 and 2.33.4, but one might guess that it was used by Calvus. For the vocative, cf. *Ars* 3.464.

eadem sequerisque fugisque:
eadem is nominative singular, *pace* Palmer *ad loc.*:

> 'You pursue and fly from the same things,' viz. your horns. . . . Loers quotes *Met.* 4.461 *volvitur Ixion, et se sequiturque fugitque* which proves that *eadem* is plural accusative not nominative singular as some have supposed. 'There would be nothing wonderful in being at once pursuer and pursued; a dog, for instance, chased by his master, while he, the dog, chases a cat, is at once pursuer and pursued; the marvel is that a person can at the same instant pursue and be pursued by the same object.'

I find *eadem* = 'the same things' awkward, too vague to refer to *cornua*, and the wrong gender to refer to *vultus* as Damsté (1905) 44 wishes. Palmer's analogy is charming, but over-pedantic, and *Met.* 4.461 *se sequiturque fugitque* is hardly 'proof' that *eadem* here is accusative plural. *eadem* as nominative singular expresses the split in Io very well; the object of the verbs does not need to be defined.

106:
Housman (1897b) 289 finds the line 'comical' and deemed it spurious. It is, in fact, pure Ovid. For pentameters consisting of inter-

changeable halves with anaphora, cf. 11.116n., 13.102n., 163–4n. Such lines inevitably fall foul of some critics: with Housman's comments cf. Seneca *Con.* 2.2.12 on *Ars* 2.24.

107:
Heinsius' belief that the five spondaic feet render the line 'languidiorem', coupled with his objection to *portus* = 'mouth of a river', leads him to suggest *ostia per septem Nilus demissus in aequor.* But for similarly spondaic hexameters in the *Heroides*, see Palmer *ad loc.*; cf. 11.25n. Note esp. 7.49, which like our verse describes the activity of water. On *portus*, see below.

septem:
Poets regularly refer to the Nile's seven mouths. See e.g. Palmer *ad loc.*, McKeown (1998) on *Am.* 2.13.9–10.

Nilus:
For the Nile as the end-point of Io's wanderings, cf. e.g. Aeschylus *Prom.* 846ff., *Supp.* 561ff. More than a hint of personification in 107–8 *Nilus . . . exuit* makes the Nile not simply the location of Io's transformation back to human form, but the agent of it. In this, the Nile has usurped what is usually Jupiter's role: Aeschylus *Supp.* 571ff., *Prom.* 848–9, and *Met.* 1.733ff. (although note the role of the Nile at 728 *ultimus inmenso restabas, Nile, labori*). Hypermestra has personal reasons for suppressing details of kindnesses shown by Jupiter to Io: see 109–10n.

portus:
For *portus* = 'the (natural) mouth of a river', Burman *ad loc.* cites *Am.* 2.13.10 *per septem portus in maris exit aquas*, also of the Nile. 'Ovid may have been influenced by the sound of ἑπτάπορος' (McKeown (1998) on *Am. loc. cit.*), but perhaps also by Virgil *Aen.* 7.201 *portuque sedetis* (see Servius *ad loc., ante enim pro portu erat illic exitus fluminis*). Less good than *portus* is *portas*, found as a ms. reading here by Burman and by Palmer, found too in the mss. at *Am.* 2.13.10, and conjectured by Bentley at both places: Palmer's tentatively cited parallel for *portas*, Aeschylus *Prom.* 729 στενοπόροις λίμνης πύλαις, is unhelpful, as it refers not to the mouths of a river but to the Cimmerian Bosporus, just as Manilius 4.606 *hac ubi se primum porta mare fudit* refers to the straits of Messina.

emissus:
For *emittere* of the flowing of rivers into the sea, see *TLL* s.v. *emitto* 502.60ff. and 507.69ff. *Nilus . . . emissus* means not simply 'the Nile, which pours out . . .', but 'the outpouring of the Nile', 'the place where the Nile pours out'; for the Nile estuary specified as the end-point to Io's travels, cf. Aeschylus *Prom.* 846–7 and *Supp.* 311.

108:
The paradosis, *exuit insanae paelicis ora bovis*, may be interpreted in various ways. *bovis* may be genitive after *ora*, and *paelicis* genitive afer *exuit*, 'removed from the mistress the face of the cow'. So Bornecque-Prévost. For *exuo* + acc. of form cast off, cf. *Met.* 10.105 *exuit hac* [sc. *pinu*] *hominem truncoque induruit illo*. Or *paelicis* may be genitive after *ora*, and *bovis* genitive after *extimuit*, 'released from the cow the face of the mistress'. So Ehwald (1900) 25. For *exuo* + accusative of form preserved, cf. *Met.* 4.591 *Cadme, mane, teque, infelix, his exue monstris!* And *insanae* may be taken with either *paelicis* or *bovis*, although it more naturally goes with the latter (it is as a cow that Io is mad—cf. 93 *furis*). Word-order is not definitive in resolving the ambiguities. If the paradosis is kept, the confusion of genitives may be a deliberate ploy to denote the elaborate intertwining of human and bovine that is now disentangled by the Nile. *exuo* + genitive can be defended only as a Hellenism, but may be sound nevertheless. Birt's interpretation ((1887) 428)—*insanae* as dative after *exuit*, and *paelicis . . . bovis* as a compound noun, 'cow-mistress'—is extremely awkward, even if with *paelex-bos* one compares Lycophron 1292 ταυροπάρθενος; see Ehwald (1900) 24.

It may be that emendation is required. *exuit insana paelicis ora bove*, 'released from the mad cow the face of the mistress', preferred by Heusinger, Ehwald in his edition, and Goold, is unambiguous. Heinsius' *exuit insanae paelicis ora bovi* is less good: the dative after *exuo* can be explained only as a *dativus commodi*, or by analogy with *adimo* + dative; and *insanae* is ambiguous (genitive or dative). *exuit insanam paelicis ora bovem*, in Madvig's marginalia, is unlikely, since *exuo* + double accusative is not a classical usage.

109ff.:
Hypermestra now begins her peroration: a careful and subtle request to Lynceus that he come to her rescue. She first stresses her grim situation (111–122), presenting all details in the worst possible light,

and increasingly focusing on herself: thus she touches upon the Danaids' flight from Egypt (111–2), the loss of her cousins and the (metaphorical) loss of her sisters (115–8), her own impending trial (119–20), and her inevitable death as the last of a great family (121–2). Here, Hypermestra is concerned to emphasise her own troubles, and some of the details of her account, as a result, will not flatter Lynceus, and may constitute a rebuke to spur him to action. For the remainder of the epistle (123ff.), Hypermestra presents herself as a hero resolute in the face of adversity, but allows Lynceus careful glimpses of her helplessness and dependancy on his affection. See nn. below.

109–10:
'Why do I tell of very distant events, for which grey elders are my source? My own lifetime, look, gives me reason to grieve.' Vague doubts have regularly been expressed concerning this couplet: Bentley brackets it, cf. Heinsius, '. . . ne quid dissimulem, distichon hoc mihi suspectum est uno nomine, nec Nasonem omni ex parte refert'; Jaekel (1973) 243, '. . . the way in which the Io-episode and the contents of the letter are linked (109–118) seems artificial—not organic'. The arch phraseology of *cana senectus* and *anni . . . mei* (see nn. below) was perhaps part of the problem; as, no doubt, was the use of a clichéed formula (e.g. *Met.* 8.879 *quid moror externis?* with Bömer (1969–1986) *ad loc.*) which doesn't ring true given Hypermestra's emotional involvement in her Io narrative.

But the arch tone and abruptness of 109f. has point, and the lines should be kept. Hypermestra has omitted the final details of Io's story, given at e.g. Aeschylus *Supp.* 571ff. and *Prom.* 848–52—Zeus' rôle in restoring Io to her former shape (see on 107 *Nilus*), his soothing of her frenzy, the subsequent birth of Epaphus, and, according to Pseudo-Apollodorus *Bib.* 2.1.3, her marriage to Telegonus.

> We might note that, whereas the flashbacks to Io in the Supplices often mention Io's ultimate redemption, Ovid's heroine makes but passing allusion to that story's happy ending (86), for, quite clearly, this would, for her, vitiate the cogency of the identification.
>
> (Jacobson (1974) 134)

More crucially, given that Hypermestra identifies herself with Io, the omission represents her wish not to express too great a hope for her own salvation, particularly since that salvation seems to lie with the

husband she nearly murdered. Cf. 86n., 107n. *Nilus*. It remains for Lynceus to take the hint.

109 ultima:
'very remote in time', *OLD* s.v. *ultimus* 3. Cf. *Supp*. 49–55, where the Danaids refer to Io's as an old story. The sense 'of very little importance, relevance' (*OLD* q.v. 8) is also present.

referam:
Given that *ultima referre* refers to what Hypermestra has been doing for the past 24 verses, the deliberative subjunctive *referam*, 'Why should I . . .?', 'Why am I to . . .?' is extremely arch and affected—it should perhaps be kept for that very reason (109–10n.). Worth considering, however, is Heinsius' conjecture *refero*.

109–10 quorum mihi cana senectus/auctor:
Hypermestra mentions the source of her information—a common device in Ovid, often employed elsewhere, particularly in parentheses, playfully to undermine suspension of disbelief (11.97–8n. *hunc ensem . . . tradidit ensem . . . iste*). Here, the appeal to the source of the story stresses its remoteness; it may also indicate to Ovid's reader that, for him too, the tale is an old one (cf. 85n. *scilicet*).

109 cana senectus:
For *senectus* as concrete noun, 'aged people', cf. e.g. Lucan 2.232. For the aged as (reliable) storytellers, cf. e.g. *Met*. 8.721–2 *haec mihi non vani (neque erat, cur fallere vellent)/narravere senes; equidem pendentia vidi* . . ., where, as often, they are paired with autopsy as reliable sources of information: see Hollis (1970) *ad loc*., 'The formula was a time-honoured one in classical literature.'

Strangely, the phrase has caused some difficulty here. Bentley conjectures *vetustas*; and L. Müller (1862) 194 holds the peculiar notion that *senectus* refers to the old-age of Hypermestra herself: 'In vers 109 und 110 ist sie plötzlich zur Greisin geworden'.

110 auctor? dant . . .:
For sense pause at diairesis after first-foot spondee cf. e.g. 11.130; Platnauer *LEV* 23 records 11 instances in Ovid. The resulting enjambement is striking, and suits Hypermestra's empassioned reference to her own misfortune (cf. *ecce*).

anni . . . mei:
Burman cites *Fast.* 1.537 *talibus ut dictis nostros descendit in annos* for *anni* 'pro temporibus'.

111–12:
A single couplet expresses Hypermestra's own troubles as grand catastrophe: war, expulsion, and exile. Just as at 61–2 the murderous voice manipulated the background to the myth in order to present the grooms as deserving death (61–2n.), so here Hypermestra manipulates these same details in order to present herself as thoroughly wretched. Ovid's reader may contrast Hypermestra's account with that of Aeschylus' Danaids:

> Here comparison with Aeschylus is very fruitful. In the *Supplices* Danaus and his daughters leave of their own free will, they go to Argos (not exactly *ultimus orbis*), and conceive of it as the return to their homeland, a delightful place.
>
> (Jacobson (1974) 135)

111 bella:
It seems likely that the three short sentences of 111–2 describe the details of the Danaids' departure from Egypt and their arrival in Argos in chronological order: certainly, *regnoque domoque/pellimur* chronologically precedes *eiectos ultimus orbis habet*. The *bella* are therefore unlikely to be the fighting in Argos that Hyginus describes, *qui* [sc. *Aegypti filii*] *postquam Argos venerunt, oppugnare patruum coeperunt* (168.3), and which some scholars have claimed provided the backdrop for Aeschylus *Aegyptii* (Winnington-Ingram (1961) 142 and 145). Rather, *bella* refer to the beginnings of the quarrel back in Egypt, for which see 61–2n. and 61n. *patruelia regna*. Hypermestra's claim that these quarrelling brothers 'waged war' on each other, *bella . . . gerunt*, may be hyperbole for pathetic effect; but she may yet be supported by an early version of the myth: the single fragment from the epic poem *Danais* (on which see e.g. Garvie (1969) 178f., Johansen-Whittle (1980) 1.44) appears to present the Danaids themselves getting involved in fighting while still in Egypt, καὶ τότ' ἄρ' ὡπλίζοντο θοῶς Δαναοῖο θύγατρες/πρόσθεν εὐρρεῖος ποταμοῦ, Νείλοιο ἄνακτος.

111–2 regnoque domoque/pellimur; eiectos . . .:
The departure from Egypt is presented as exile—a pathetic detail, emotionally conveyed by enjambement. *regnum* here is not simply 'kingdom'

but 'royal office'; so too, perhaps, at 61. For the kingship as cause of the quarrel, see 61n. *patruelia regna*. Some versions of the myth might support Hypermestra's claim to forcible ejection from Egypt; but the reader will almost inevitably contrast the prologue to Aeschylus' *Supplices*, where the Danaids leave Egypt of their own free will:

> Δίαν δὲ λιποῦσαι
> χθόνα σύγχροτον Συρίαι φεύγομεν,
> οὔτιν' ἐφ' αἵματι δημηλασίαν,
> ψήφῳ πόλεως γνωσθεῖσαι,
> ἀλλ' αὐτογενῆ φυξανορίαν,
> γάμον Αἰγύπτου παίδων ἀσεβῆ. . . .
>
> (Aeschylus *Supp.* 4–9)

Aeschylus' Danaids view themselves as fugitives (cf. Murray (1958) 56ff.), but their flight is voluntary and welcome. Hypermestra's account owes more to Aeschylus' Io than to his Danaids:

> τοιοῖσδε πεισθεὶς Λοξίου μαντεύμασιν
> εξήλασέν με κἀπέκλησε δωμάτων,
> ἄκουσαν ἄκων·
>
> (Aeschylus *Prom.* 669–71)

For the continued influence of Io in this couplet, see on *ultimus orbis* below.

112 ultimus orbis:
ultimus orbis is here Argos. Hypermestra inverts the usual description of Egypt as the edge of the world, and in particular Aeschylus *Prom.* 846. There, Io, an Argive, is told to travel to Κάνωβος, ἐσχάτη χθονός; here, Hypermestra, an Egyptian, calls Argos *ultimus orbis*. 'She is still retaining the association of herself with Io' (Jacobson (1974) 135).

Some scholars have advanced perverse interpretations for *ultimus orbis*. One such is reported and countered by Burman *ad loc.*, 'ultimum orbem Aegyptum hic intelligit ex veterum sententia Broukhusius ad Propert. 2.13.40. . . .'; Birt (1877) 418, 'hoc est eiecti sumus qui ultimam orbem (Africam) habitamus'. They stem from a misguided desire to bring Ovid's Hypermestra in line with Aeschylus' Danaids. Cf. Jacobson (1974) 135.

Word-play and anaphora of *ultimus* support Hypermestra's argument: 'Why do I tell a story so remote in time (109 *ultima*)? We are stranded on the remotest edge of the world (112 *ultimus*).'

113 potitur:
Verse 113 is an interpolation. '*potĭtur* can be paralleled at Lucil. fr. 194 Kr. [*ROL* 214] and Caecilius 109 Ribb. The verse need not be condemned', Jacobson (1974) 231. But these early poets cannot be used to provide parallels for Ovidian prosody. '*potĭtur* occurs at least seven times in Ovid [12 according to Deferrari (1939)]: *potĭtur* never' (Palmer *ad loc.*)

114:
The verse has been displaced from its proper place between 61 and 63 (61–2n.).

115:
A recurring idea in Hypermestra's epistle: cf. 1–2, 73, 121. Here the formerly multitudinous family is a *populus*, *OLD* s.v. *populus* 4 'a number of people, multitude, crowd'. The *pars exiguissima* (for the superlative in classical Latin, cf. only Pliny *Ep.* 7.24.7) is of course Lynceus. The detail does not flatter Hypermestra's addressee, but she is here emphasising her family's demise. For that reason, the paradosis *restat* is preferable to *restas*, found in five mss. by Heinsius and approved of by him: Hypermestra is here concerned only with the fact that just one *frater* remains, not with the identity of the survivor (cf. 80n. *abes*).

116:
Hypermestra mourns not only the murdered but the murderers: a nice piece of paradoxical sophistry, which is explained in the following couplet. She attempts to soften the incongruity of lamenting her murderous sisters by her choice of phrase for 'murder'—a euphemism, *leto dare*, on which see R.D. Williams (1960) on Virgil *Aen.* 5.806 *daret leto*; the phrase was used to announce a funeral, see Varro *L.* 7.42. 'I lament my butchered cousins and my sisters who butchered them', *necare, occidere*, or sim., would no doubt be too indelicate a form of expression.

117:
Hypermestra has lost not only her cousins but also her sisters—hyperbole, since they are not both lost (*periere*) in the same sense. The sons of Aegyptus are dead, but the Danaids are 'lost to me',

mihi . . . periere, i.e. alienated from her because they chose murder while she did not. Cf. *Ciris* 306, Carme of her deified daughter, *mihi certe, nata, peristi.* Wright's translation (in Dryden (1680)) of our couplet captures its sense, 'A double stock of Tears by me are spilt/Both for my Brothers' death and Sisters' guilt'.

Surprisingly, many scholars have taken our verse as a straightforward reference to the Danaids' deaths (so Palmer, Shuckburgh, Garvie (1969) 165 and 170, Johansen-Whittle (1980) 1.49). Jacobson (1974) 130 devotes considerable energy to proving these views wrong: it is sufficient to note that Hypermestra clearly thinks her sisters alive and well at e.g. 15; and that one who dwells insistently on the deaths of her cousins would hardly refer so casually to the deaths of her sisters.

The Danaids are not dead; they are just dead to Hypermestra. But the heroine's melodramatic phrasing allows Ovid to incorporate a hint to his reader of a fate in store for the Danaids quite different from that hinted at in 15–6 (n.). For their deaths at the hands of Lynceus, see *TrGF Adespota* 454, and Schol. Euripides *Hec.* 886, where Lynceus kills both the Danaids and their father. For their punishment in the underworld, see 15n.

118:
'Let either crowd accept my tears'; or perhaps '. . . its own tears', 'the tears due to it', following *suas* for *meas,* suggested by Heinsius, and found as the reading of one ms. by Giomini.

turba:
For Hypermestra's use of *turba,* cf. 2n., 114, and 121. Given the context of two hostile parties here, *turma* might be worth considering. The word has strong military connotations; it originally denoted a squadron of thirty men, but became applicable to any number. Applied to the Danaids, it would suggest Amazonian qualities (cf. *Ars* 3.2, *Pont.* 4.10.51). *turma* is not found in the mss. here, but *turma* and *turba* are elsewhere regularly confused by the scribes (e.g. *Am.* 2.13.18, *Ars* 3.2, Horace *Carm.* 3.4.47).

119–20:
Hypermestra returns to where her epistle began—her present predicament, pointed out with the interjection *en.* This description of imprisonment and impending trial is couched in Roman forensic ter-

minology: see following nn. The paradox of the righteous crime is again reframed (120n.).

119 poenae crucianda reservor:
'I am kept for torture as a punishment': some of the torments she fears are in store are enumerated at 9ff. *reservor* is technical, of the accused being kept for trial (so Cicero *Ver.* 5.173 *ad illud populi Romani iudicium reservari*), or of the condemned for punishment (so Cicero *Mil.* 86 *ad hanc insignem poenam reservatus*).

120:
'What will happen to a guilty person, when I am prosecuted for praiseworthy behaviour?' The paradox of Hypermestra's predicament is here expressed by an argument *e minore*; cf. 5–6 where the same paradox is framed differently. With the formula of our line, cf. *Am.* 1.6.31 *quid facies hosti, qui sic excludis amantem?*, with McKeown (1989) *ad loc.* for further examples of *e minore* arguments similarly expressed. For *fiet* here, the mss. give the alternatives *fiat* and *fieret*, on which Heinsius commented 'utrumque bene'; McKeown's citations, though, (if the mss. can be trusted) suggest that the future is idiomatic in such expressions. *sonti* is hypothetical, 'any guilty person', but there is perhaps a hint at the Danaids, the specific guilty party in this case—if so, the reader may supply his own answer to *quid fiet sonti*: either reconciliation (15n.) or death and punishment (117n.).

rea laudis agar:
'Brilliant is the oxymoron *rea laudis*' (Jacobson (1974) 129), and a rival for Horace's *splendide mendax* (*Carm.* 3.11.35). For *reus* + genitive of offence, see *OLD* q.v. 2c. For *laus* = praiseworthy actions (here rhetorically contrasted with *sonti*), see *OLD* 3b; Shuckburgh *ad loc.* compares 8.55. *rea agar* refers to the impending trial: *OLD* s.v. *ago* 16c, '*reum agere*, to bring a case against, indict, prosecute'.

121–2:
The family's reversal of fortunes will, Hypermestra imagines, reach its climax in her own death, the last-but-one surviving member of the band of cousins. Only Lynceus will remain. Her designation of him as *uno fratre manente* stems not from a 'strange view of their relationship' (Jacobson (1974) 126), but from an attempt to stress her plight as wholly pathetic, and to goad Lynceus into action.

121 et:

Editors vary in their punctuation of 120–2. Jahn, Merkel-Ehwald, Palmer, and Showerman-Goold make the verses 121–2 a continuation of the clause *cum rea laudis agar* in 120, '. . . when I am made a defendant on a charge of praiseworthy actions, and (when I) fall . . .', *agar* and *cadam* presumably two present subjunctives. Others make only 120 a question, and begin a new sentence (a statement) at 121: so Burman, Sedlmayer, Bornecque, Riese, and Dorrie. On this latter interpretation, the *et* is rather weak and superfluous: Heinsius conjectures *en*; and Damsté (1905) 45 suggests *ah!*, taking 120 *sonti* as *mihi sonti*, and 121–2 as an answer to the question posed in 119–20, 'What will happen to me when I am found guilty? Ah!, I shall fall. . . .'

The best approach is that suggested by Ehwald (1900) 26; cf. Reeve (1974) 63. 120 is a parenthesis arising out of 119; the *et* connects 121 to 119; 119 *reservor* describes Hypermestra's present predicament, 122 *cadam* predicts the imminent future.

en ego, quod vivis, poenae crucianda reservor
—quid fiet sonti, cum rea laudis agar?—
et consanguineae. . . .

centesima:

The first hand of P gave *centensima.* The suffix used to form such ordinal numbers is variously given in the mss. as either *-ensimus* or *-esimus.* The latter is more prevalent (see e.g. *TLL* s.v. *mille(n)simus* 984.30f.), but this is not necessarily indicative of ancient orthographical practice: forms in *-ensimus* are common in inscriptions.

122 infelix:

Cf. 93n. *infelix.*

cadam:

cado is the *vox propria* for dying in battle, *OLD* s.v. *cado* 9; cf. the English 'fall'. *cado* meaning 'die' regularly occurs in military contexts (e.g. 9.36 . . . *infesto ne vir ab hoste cadat*), or as part of a military metaphor (e.g. *Am.* 2.14.15–6, where abortion is presented as a form of warfare), and is common in historiographical writing (*TLL* s.v. *cado* 23.9ff.). In our line and at 12 *cadam*, Hypermestra presents her death more as the fall of a warrior in battle than as the execution of a criminal.

123–4:
Having depicted herself as thoroughly wretched, prepared nobly to accept a grim fate, Hypermestra now makes her carefully ambiguous appeal. In verses 125–6, the apodosis of a conditional clause asks for Lynceus' help, before swiftly moving on to dwell on the alternative (125–6n.). In 123–4, Hypermestra sets out the protasis, which Lynceus can interpret in one of two ways.

The couplet may be taken as an appeal based on Hypermestra's noble deed of sparing Lynceus' life: 'If you are concerned for your right-acting sister, and are a worthy possessor of the gift I allotted you'—i.e. life. The key words are *piae* and *munus*: Lynceus is to rise to meet Hypermestra's grand service (*OLD* s.v. *munus* 6 '. . . A kindness, service, favour'), and respond in kind by saving her life.

Or these lines may be taken as an appeal based on affection and the couple's sexual relationship. Allusion flags the couplet as an elegiac address. Appeals to *pia cura* are common in an erotic context: see e.g. McKeown (1998) on *Am.* 2.16.47. Verse 123 is similar in form to, and intertextual with, the following such appeals:

> at tu, cura mei si te pia tangit, Oreste
> (*Her.* 8.15)
>
> si qua mei tamen est in te pia cura relicti
> (*Am.* 2.16.47)
>
> estne tibi, Cerinthe, tuae pia cura puellae
> (Sulpicia [Tibullus] 3.17.1)

Jacobson (1974) 10 and Spoth (1992) 197 draw attention to the fact that Hypermestra has applied the adjective *pius* to herself, in contrast to the above examples where the adjective describes the *cura*. But, if Lynceus is familiar with the terms of love-elegy, he, like Ovid's reader, will note the elegiac motif on which 123 is based, and catch a glimpse of an address from lover to beloved. Such an address is not undermined by *soror*: for *frater* and *soror* as elegiac terms, see e.g. Martial 2.4.7–8 [of an inappropriate mother-son relationship] *matrem, quae cupit esse se sororem/nec matrem iuvat esse nec sororem*, *OLD* s.v. *soror* 1d, s.v. *frater* 3b, *TLL* s.v. *frater* 1256.22ff. This may be seen as an appeal to Lynceus on grounds of her love for him, and particularly of their wedding-night love-making. *munera* need not be dismissed as plural for singular: perhaps Hypermestra gave Lynceus another *munus* besides his life. Cf. Johansen-Whittle (1980) 1.49, quoted under 69–70n. For *munus* with reference to sex, cf. 4.137, Adams (1982)

164. Here, the *munus* would best be taken as the bride's virginity, as perhaps at Calvus *FLP* 8 *hunc tanto munere digna* [*digna* is imperative]. Hypermestra hopes Lynceus will prove worthy (124 *dignus*) of such a gift: for *dignus* of a worthy partner in an erotic relationship, cf. e.g. 4.33 *at bene successit, digno quod adurimur igni*, Sulpicia [Tibullus] 3.13.10 *cum digno* [sc. *Cerintho*] *digna* [sc. *Sulpicia*] *fuisse ferar.*

Hypermestra thus covers two eventualities: whether Lynceus admires his pious sister, or loves his affectionate wife, he cannot fail to respond.

123 Lynceu:

The correct name for Hypermestra's husband was restored by Heinsius. For the vocative *Lynceu*, cf. Propertius 2.34.9, there a pseudonym, perhaps for Lucius Varius Rufus (J. Boucher (1958)). Where the name occurs in Latin literature, corruptions are often found, but the mss. for the *Heroides* seem particularly at fault: for their maltreatment of other proper names, see 13.25–6n. and 13.35n.; contrast however their treatment of the name *Hypermestra* (14.1n.). In our verse, most read *Line*, accompanied by something which attempts to retain the metre; the rest, including the second hand of P, give *remanet*, no doubt an early conjecture (the first hand of P is erased, but from the microfilm copy appears to end in *-e* : perhaps *Line*?). Similarly, of those mss. that give a superscription to the epistle, most give the name *Linus*: on this corrupted form, see Heinsius on our verse, 'apud Scholiastem Germanici tamen et Horatii, Statii quoque uno in loco *Linus* mendose appellatur'. The mss. for Planudes' translation cope, as one might expect, rather better (λιγκεῦ, λιγγεῦ).

125–6:

A careful plea for help. What Hypermestra really desires (*opem*), she quickly passes over; she dwells instead upon the alternative. *dede neci* must here mean 'consign me to death (sc. by failing to rescue me)'—the actual cause of death will be the punishment meted out by Danaus (129 *pretium pietatis iniquum*). But the phrasing of *dede neci* is clearly intended to dissuade Lynceus from following this option: if he does not bring help, he will be a murderer, *OLD* s.v. *do* 20c '*leto, morti, dare,* etc., to cause to die, send to death or destruction' and s.v. *nex* 1c.

Editors print the reading of all mss., *vel fer opem vel dede neci.* On this setting-out of the two alternative courses of action, etc., see Shuckburgh *ad loc.*:

> "Either help me, or (if you must) abandon me to death, but at any rate see that my body is duly burnt." *que* couples *adde* closely with *dede*; she does not ask Lynceus to abandon her to death, but puts the two alternatives, "either help me, or *if* you let me die, give me due funeral rites."

Imperative as almost equivalent to the protasis of a conditional clause ('If you abandon me to death . . .') is a common usage (although one might argue that its occurrence here in parallel with the 'real' imperative *adfer* is slightly difficult). Nevertheless, it seems awkward that, with *vel . . . vel*, the alternatives are put on an equal footing. *dede neci* is no fit apodosis to 123–4; abandoning someone to death is not an action exemplary of *cura*, even if the correct obsequies are carried out (126ff.). There is surely only one action that Lynceus must perform if he fulfills the protasis 123–4—'bring help'; *dede neci* etc. is very much second best. One might therefore conjecture:

> <u>adfer</u> opem; vel dede neci defunctaque vita. . . .

For *adfer opem* as hexameter beginning, cf. e.g. *Met.* 8.601. For sense-pause at a strong second-foot caesura, see Platnauer *LEV* 25. For *vel* = 'or failing that', cf. e.g. Caesar *Gal.* 4.16.5–6 *magnopere orabant ut sibi auxilium ferret . . .; vel, si id facere occupationibus rei publicae prohiberetur, exercitum modo Rhenum transportaret.* The single existing *vel* and the propensity towards corruption at line beginning would have been sufficient for *adfer* to become *vel fer.*

The same mix of heroic and elegiac is employed here as in the preceding couplet (123–4n.). Hypermestra's request for mercy or burial recalls similar requests from defeated warriors (notably Turnus at Virgil *Aeneid* 12.932ff.). And the grandiose description of her corpse, *defunctaque vita/corpora,* is intertextual with Virgil's description of the inhabitants of the underworld,

> matres atque viri defunctaque corpora vita
> magnanimum heroum, pueri innuptaeque puellae,
> impositique rogis iuvenes ante ora parentum
> (Virgil *Georg.* 4.475–7 = *Aen.* 6.306–8)

Note that Ovid keeps the plural *corpora,* despite there being only one corpse, but introduces variation from Virgil by splitting the phrase between two lines. What Hypermestra has omitted—the genitive *magnanimum heroum*—reveals that the grand *defunctaque vita/corpora* is not wholly appropriate for her, and that she is here presenting her death

and funeral as those of a hero (cf. 122n. *cadam*, and 128 *titulo* with 127–8n.).

But there is equally here a hint at an erotic relationship with Lynceus. The visualization of one's own obsequies, attended, or even carried out, by a frequently tearful beloved, is an elegiac *topos* (Tibullus 1.1.61ff., 1.3.5ff., Lygdamus [Tibullus] 3.2.9ff., Propertius 1.17.19ff., 1.19.3ff., 2.13.17ff., 2.24.35ff., 3.16.21ff.; cf. *Her.* 11.123ff.). See further on 127–8.

The help that Hypermestra hopes for is probably rescue. The help that Lynceus provides, according to other versions of the myth, takes two forms: killing Danaus and/or the Danaids (117n.; for Lynceus killing Danaus only, see Servius on *Aen.* 10.497, and perhaps *LIMC* s.v. *Danaos* 5, which may be a representation of a scene from Theodectes' lost play *Lynceus*, on which see 78n.); or the acquital of Hypermestra and the subsequent trial of Danaus and the Danaids (see 4n., 15n.), in which Lynceus may himself have had an active role (Garvie (1969) 209).

126 furtivis insuper adde rogis:
If this is simply a request to build a pyre, as Palmer suggests, it seems ludicrously over-explicit: does Lynceus need to be told that he must first have built a pyre before he can add the corpse on top? *insuper adde* implies that Hypermestra's corpse is to be placed as an addition onto already-existing pyres (for *insuper adde*, see Bömer (1969–1986) on *Met.* 6.362), which have been built in secret (*furtivis*). Hypermestra seems to be alluding to the secret burial of the grooms (secret, that is, from Danaus). She asks to be burnt with them—a poignant detail. That it is allusively expressed suggests that Ovid's reader was expected to be familiar with it. It is easy to imagine that so tragic a motif as the denial of funeral rites was treated in one of the lost tragic treatments of the myth, perhaps Aeschylus' *Danaides*. Cf. the detail in some versions of the myth (see on 15 *paeniteat*) where the Danaids, as part of the process by which they are purified of blood-guilt, bury their husbands' decapitated corpses, which, presumably, had previously remained unburied.

127–8:
Hypermestra instructs Lynceus on the details of her funeral, including a grave inscription whose contents she dictates in the following couplet. Cf. the couplet-long epitaphs envisaged for themselves by Phyllis (2.147–8) and Dido (7.197–8).

Here again (cf. 123–4n., 125–6n.) the heroic and the elegiac jostle for position. The imagining of one's own grave-inscription is a common motif in love-elegy (e.g. Knox on *Her.* 2.147–8, McKeown (1998) on *Am.* 2.6.61–2); but epitaphs may equally be a record of heroic deeds. Hypermestra draws on both associations in making her appeal to Lynceus. Her particular use of the motif becomes clear when viewed against an intertext:

> . . . nostri memorem sepulcro
> scalpe querelam.
>
> (Horace *Carm.* 3.11.51–2)

Horace's Hypermestra asks Lynceus to carve an epitaph. Note the intertextual markers *sepulcro* (*Carm.* 51), *sepulchra* (*Her.* 128); *scalpe* (*Carm.* 52), *sculptaque* (*Her.* 128); *nostri* (*Carm.* 51), *nostra* (*Her.* 128).

The differences between the two passages are telling. Unlike Horace's Hypermestra, Ovid's dictates her own grave inscription—a typically elegiac thing to do (cf. Tibullus 1.3.55–6, Lygdamus [Tibullus] 3.2.29–30, Propertius 2.13.35–6). The inscription is short (128 *brevi*) inasmuch as it consists of a single elegiac couplet (cf. Ovid's Dido who, if one follows Housman's emendation at 7.196, requests *hoc tantum . . . carmen*).

Ovid's Hypermestra adds a reference to Lynceus' 'faithful tears' (127 *lacrimis . . . fidelibus*), another elegiac motif: for the beloved's tears at the graveside, cf. e.g. 11.127, Tibullus 1.1.61–2, Lygdamus [Tibullus] 3.2.11–2; for *fidelis* of the faith between lovers, cf. e.g. 17.143–4 and 215; for tears sprinkled on the remains of the corpse, cf. *Her.* 11.127n. *in vulnera*.

Horace's Hypermestra asks for a *querela*, an elegiac lament (M. Lowrie (1997) 288). But what Ovid's Hypermestra dictates is not a *querela*, despite the fact that this would be ideally suited to the epistle's elegiac couplets, but a *titulus* (128). 'The terminology is essentially masculine—or rather, heroic', Jacobson (1974) 130. A *titulus* is a chronicle of great deeds (*OLD* s.v. *titulus* 2b; cf. *OLD* q.v. 7 'Claim to glory or fame, distinction'). Hypermestra's *titulus* is to record her great deed of warding-off death from her *frater*. Like Verginius Rufus (Pliny *Ep.* 6.10.4 = 9.19.1), she requests for herself an epitaph that will record her own selflessness.

The terms in which Ovid's Hypermestra requests the epitaph are equally grand. In Horace, *sculpo/scalpo* takes direct object of the inscription + indirect object of material inscribed upon; in Ovid, direct object of material + indirect object of inscription, a more

recondite and lofty turn of phrase (cf. R.D. Anderson *et al.* (1979) 142, on the Gallus fragment s.v. *fixa legam*). And a straightforward imperative in Horace (52 *scalpe*) becomes in Ovid a passive jussive subjunctive (128 *sculptaque sint*).

nostri in Horace (51) is objective genitive after *memorem*, and either a 'royal we', = 'in memory of me', or a reference to Hypermestra and Lynceus as a couple, = 'in memory of us' (so e.g. Juvencius (1838)); commentators there have argued over whose tomb is meant by 51 *sepulcro* (see e.g. Jacobson (1974) 139), and it has been asserted by some that Horace is hinting at a happy outcome known to the reader, namely the burial of Hypermestra and Lynceus in the same tomb after a long life together (F. Cairns (1975) 136–7). Such allusive hints at events beyond the scope of the poem suit Ovid's method (see intro.), and so he keeps Horace's hints, but attempts to express them in a sharper manner: by *nostra sepulchra* (128), Hypermestra ostensibly means her own tomb, *nostra* as 'royal we' in keeping with her grand tone (K-S 1.88); but the literal meaning 'our tomb' is felt as a hint at their eventual burial side by side.

129–30:

Hypermestra's epitaph is 'false', in two senses: in no version of the myth does she die in such circumstances or gain such an epitaph; and the heroic picture of herself here presented is contradicted even by her own narrative elsewhere in the epistle. The wording of her epitaph is designed not only to impress any passer-by who will read it, but also to prompt Lynceus to forestall the need for it at all.

exul is an emotive word, especially on an epitaph (for death and burial away from one's homeland as a theme of grave-inscriptions, see R. Lattimore (1942) 200–2), but is applicable to Hypermestra's case only with extreme hyperbole (111–2n.).

The inscription is to mention the deceased by name (129 *Hypermestra*—for the orthography see on 1), as is regular. But the *manus*, which played so important a role in Hypermestra's narrative, is here conspicuous by its absence, and all the more so if one compares the two other epitaphs in the *Heroides*: both Dido and Phyllis mention their *manus* (2.148, 7.198). Hypermestra's epitaph is to assign the credit for the brave deed it describes not to the *manus*, but to Hypermestra herself.

pretium pietatis iniquum,/quam mortem fratri depulit, ipsa tulit is a neat sententia, very similar to those expressed by Dido and Phyllis:

Phyllida Demophoon leto dedit, hospes amantem;
ille necis causam praebuit, ipsa manum.

(2.147–8)

praebuit Aeneas et causam mortis et ensem.
ipsa sua Dido concidit usa manu.

(7.197–8)

The alliteratively ironic *pretium pietatis* (*OLD* s.v. *pretium* 1b, and cf. the Greek misqovi), qualified by *iniquum*, and the jingle *depulit* . . . *tulit* provide a rhetorical flourish; but there is little substance behind the rhetoric. The reader of the epitaph will hardly guess the truth, that Hypermestra's great deed was to decide not to commit murder. To refrain from killing someone is hardly to do them a favour (Cicero *Phil.* 2.5, addressed to Antony, *quale autem beneficium est, quod te abstinueris nefario scelere?*). The phrasing of the relative clause, *quam mortem fratri depulit, ipsa tulit*, is deceptive. The reader of the epistle might take it as a reference to Hypermestra's imagined death by the same sword with which she was to have killed Lynceus (cf. 12). But even so, *mortem depulit* is less than truthful. Any reader of the epitaph unfamiliar with Hypermestra's cicumstances will surely imagine that Hypermestra died while defending her *frater* from a third party ('. . . she won as an unjust prize for piety the death she warded-off from her cousin').

fratri is calculated to bring Lynceus to Hypermestra's rescue. Should Lynceus fail to act, posterity will know him from Hypermestra's tomb only as her *frater*—fittingly enough, perhaps, for he will have failed to respond to his wife's subtle pleas to respond to their conjugal relationship. His name will not be recorded; contrast Demophoon and Aeneas, who will gain fame of a kind on the epitaphs of Phyllis and Dido respectively. The reader of Hypermestra's epitaph may even wonder why the *frater* whom she saved was unable, or unwilling, to save her in return.

131–2:

The final couplet of the epistle is a masterful drawing-together of themes already explored, and a last-ditch appeal from Hypermestra to Lynceus.

129–30 was a false ending. Phyllis and Dido close their epistles (2 and 7) with dictated epitaphs, and thereby create an expectation that Hypermestra's dictated epitaph will likewise be her final word. So great is this expectation that some scholars have thought 131–2

spurious: so C. Dilthey (1863) 147, Goold (1974) 479. But unlike Phyllis and Dido, who expressed a resolution to take their own lives and, according to all extant versions of their myths, did indeed do so, Hypermestra writes with a purpose: she hopes to be saved by her addressee. Contrast Dido's assertion *nec quia te nostra sperem prece posse moveri, alloquor*, 7.5–6. Hypermestra has just dwelt upon her death, but she hopes for life (125–6n.); her epistle ends with a final attempt to avoid the former and ensure the latter.

A twist in the last distich is characteristic of Ovid's style, particularly in the *Amores*: see the final couplets of 1.7, 1.10, 1.14, 2.3. In our couplet, the effect works by means of a recombination of by now familiar themes. The grand tone of the epitaph immediately disappears, to leave Lynceus with a hint of Hypermestra's dependancy on him: the symmetry between 130 *depulit, ipsa tulit* and 132 *subtrahit ipse timor* may mark the contrast (Ehwald (1900) 26). The couplet contains an admission of fear: that *timor* is the final word of the epistle is a surprise for which we have been prepared ('Die entsprechenden Ausdrücke durchziehen den Brief gleichmäßig (*timor/timere* 20, 49, 71, 98, 132; *metus* 43; *vereri* 36; *tremor/tremo* 18, 41, 44)', Spoth (1992) 195). Here, Hypermestra's *timor* is unspecified; but Lynceus must surely take it as a declaration of helplessness in the face of her impending punishment. *sed pondere lassa catenae/est manus* is similarly an expression of weakness. *lassus* suits the unheroic tone, being 'More homely' than its metrical equivalent *fessus* (Austin (1974) on *Aen.* 2.739).

Hypermestra makes a thinly veiled attempt to disguise her admission of helplessness, by means of a now familiar device: a weary letter-writer might naturally refer to her hand as tired; but before arriving at the delayed *manus* in enjambement, the reader might have assumed that *lassa* described Hypermestra herself, and will therefore recognize this a further instance of the 'distancing' motif (see on 5). And whose is the strength that is drained by fear (*vires subtrahit ipse timor*)—Hypermestra's or the hand's? Lynceus must see through this final instance of the *manus* motif, and recognize Hypermestra's need for rescue. *scribere plura libet* is intended to entice him: the only means of discovering what the *plura* are—perhaps hope for their future life together?—is to carry out the rescue. It is left to Lynceus to act; and to Ovid's reader to speculate on the eventual happy ending.

LIST OF REFERENCES

Editions

A list of the editions mentioned in the commentary (referred to by name only).

Heinsius: *Operum P. Ovidii Nasonis Editio Nova, Nic. Heinsius Dan. f. recensuit ac notas addidit*, vol. 1 (Amsterdam, 1661)

Burman: *P. Ovidii Nasonis Opera Omnia cum integris Micylli, Ciofani et Dan. Heinsii notis et Nic. Heinsii curis secundis, cura et studio Petri Burmanni*, vol. 1 (Amsterdam, 1727)

Bentley: [See *Coniecturae Bentleianae* in Palmer, pp. 510–520]

van Lennep: *Heroidum epistularum liber et A. Sabini epistolae e Petri Burmanni recensione maxime editae, cura Davidis Iacobi van Lennep qui et suas animadversiones subiecit* (Amsterdam, 1809, 1812^2)

Amar: *P. Ovidius Naso, ex recensione Heinsio-Burmanniana cum selectis veterum ac recentiorum notis; quibus suas addidit J.A. Amar*, vol. 1 (Paris, 1820)

Jahn: *P. Ovidii Nasonis quae supersunt opera omnia ad codicum mss. et editt. fidem recognovit . . . J. Ch. Jahn*, vol. 1 (Leipzig, 1828)

Loers: *P. Ovidii Nasonis Heroides et A. Sabini Epistolae, recensuit V. Loers* (Cologne 1829)

Weise: *P. Ovidii Nasonis Opera Omnia. Textum ad codicum Lipsiensium Aldinarumque fidem accurate recognovit C.H. Weise*, vol. 1 (Leipzig, 1845)

Merkel: *P. Ovidii Nasonis Opera ex recognitione R. Merkelii*, vol. 1 (Leipzig, 1850)

Lindemann: *Ovids Werke berichtigt, übersetzt und erklärt von Heinrich Lindemann*, vol. 6 (Leipzig, 1867)

Riese: *P. Ovidii Nasonis Carmina edidit Alexander Riese*, vol. 1 (Leipzig, 1871)

Palmer (1874): *Heroides XIV, edited by A. Palmer* (London, 1874)

Shuckburgh: *P. Ovidii Nasonis Heroidum Epistulae XIII* [*Her.* 1 10, 12–14] *edited with notes and indices by Evelyn S. Shuckburgh* (London, 1879, 1885^2)

Sedlmayer: *P. Ovidi Nasonis Heroides apparatu critico instruxit et eddidit Henricus Stephanus Sedlmayer* (Vienna, 1886)

Ehwald: *P. Ovidius Naso. Ex Rudolphi Merkelii recognitione edidit R. Ehwald*, vol. 1 (Leipzig, 1888)

Palmer: *P. Ovidi Nasonis Heroides with the Greek Translation of Planudes, edited by the late Arthur Palmer* [completed by L. Purser] (Oxford, 1898)

Showerman: *Ovid, Heroides and Amores, with an English translation by Grant Showerman* (Cambridge Mass., 1914)

Bornecque-Prévost: *Ovide Heroides, texte établi par Henri Bornecque et traduit par Marcel Prévost* (Paris, 1928)

Giomini: *P. Ovidi Nasonis Heroidas recognovit et edidit Remigius Giomini*, vol. 1 (Rome, 1958), vol. 2 (Rome, 1965)

Dörrie: *P. Ovidii Nasonis Epistulae Heroidum, quas Henricus Dörrie Hannoveranus ad fidem codicum edidit* (Berlin and New York, 1971)

Goold: [Revision of Showerman by G.P. Goold; where the two edd. agree, they are referred to as Showerman-Goold] (Cambridge Mass., 1977)

Knox: *Ovid Heroides Select Epistles* [*Her.* 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 10, 11, 15] *edited by Peter E. Knox* (Cambridge, 1995)

Kenney: *Ovid Heroides XVI–XXI edited by E.J. Kenney* (Cambridge, 1996)

Other works cited

Adams, J.N., *The Latin Sexual Vocabulary* (London, 1982)
von Albrecht, M., *Die Parenthese in Ovids Metamorphosen und ihre dichterische Funktion* (Hildesheim, 1964)
Altman, J.G., *Epistolarity—Approaches to a Form* (Ohio, 1982)
Anderson, G.A., 'Lucian's Classics: some short cuts to culture', *BICS* 23 (1976), 59–67
Anderson, R.D., Parsons P.J., Nisbet, R.G.M., 'Elegiacs by Gallus from Qaṣr Ibrîm, *JRS* 69 (1979), 125–55
Arndt, P. 'Hypermnestra', in *Corolla Ludwig Curtius zum sechzigsten Geburtstag dargebracht* (Stuttgart, 1937), vol. I pp. 109–13
Austin, R.G., *P. Vergilii Maronis Aeneidos Liber Quartus* (Oxford, 1955)
——, *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Liber Secundus* (Oxford, 1964)
——, *P. Vergilii Maronis Aeneidos Liber Primus* (Oxford, 1971)
——, *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Liber Sextus* (Oxford, 1977)
Baehrens, A., *Catulli Veronensis librum interpretatus* (Leipzig, 1885)
Bailey, C., *Titi Lucreti Cari De Rerum Natura Libri Sex* (Oxford, 1947)
Bailey, D.R.S., 'Maniliana', *CR* 6 (1956), 81–6
——, *Propertiana* (Cambridge, 1956), = Bailey (1956a)
——, *Cicero's Letters to Atticus* (Cambridge, 1965–70)
Baker, S., 'Lesbia's Foot', *CPh* 55 (1960), 171–3
Barchiesi, A., 'Narratività e convenzione nelle Heroides', *MD* 19 (1987), 63–90; = *Epistulae Heroidum 1–3* (Florence, 1992), 15–41
Barrett, W.S., *Euripides Hippolytus* (Oxford, 1964)
Barsby, J.A., *Plautus Bacchides* (Warminster, 1986)
Bate, J., *Shakespeare and Ovid* (Oxford, 1993)
Bessone, F., *P. Ovidii Nasonis Heroidum Epistula XII Medea Iasoni* (Florence, 1997)
Birt, T., 'Animadversiones ad Ovidii Heroidum epistulas', *RhM* 32 (1877), 388–432
——, 'Kritischer Kommentar zu Ovids Heroiden von Heinrich Stefan Sedlmayer', *GGA* 1882, 831–62
Bömer, F., *P. Ovidius Naso Metamorphosen: Kommentar* (Heidelberg, 1969–1986)
Bonner, C., 'A study of the Danaid myth', *HSPh* 13 (1902), 129–73
Booth, J., *The second book of Amores* (Warminster, 1991)
Borthwick, E.K., 'Meleager's Lament: A note on *Anth. Pal.* 5.166', *CPh* 64 (1969), 173–5
Boucher, J., 'L'oeuvre de L. Varius Rufus d'après Properce 2.34', Études Anciennes 60 (1958), 307–22
Bréguet, E., 'In una parce duobus—thème et clichés', in *Hommages à Léon Herrmann* (*Collection Latomus* 44, 1960), pp. 205–18
Butler, H.E., *Sexti Properti Opera Omnia* (London, 1905)
Cairns, F., 'Splendide Mendax: Horace *Odes* 3.2', *G&R* 22 (1975), 129–139
Cameron, A., *The Greek Anthology from Meleager to Planudes* (Oxford, 1993)
Camps, W.A., *Propertius Elegies, Book I* (Cambridge, 1961)
——, *Propertius Elegies, Book IV* (Cambridge, 1965)
Casali, S., 'Tragic Irony in Ovid, *Heroides* 9 and 11', *CQ* 45 (1995), 505–11
Castiglioni, L., 'Decisa forficibus', *RIL* 70 (1937), 60
Conacher, D.J., *Aeschylus' Prometheus Bound* (Toronto, 1980)
Costa, C.D.N., Whittle E.W., 'Holed pitchers for the Danaids: a first allusion in Seneca?', *Mnemosyne* 26 (1973), 289–91
——, *Lucretius De Rerum Natura V* (Oxford, 1984)
Courtney, E., 'Ovidian and non-Ovidian Heroides', *BICS* 12 (1965), 63–6
——, 'Echtheitskritik: Ovidian and non-Ovidian Heroides again', *CJ* 93 (1998), 157–66
Dale, A.M., *Euripides Alcestis* (Oxford, 1954)

van Dam, H.-J., *P. Papinius Statius Silvae Book II* (Leiden, 1984)
Damsté, P.H., 'Ad Ovidii Heroides', *Menmosyne* 33 (1905), 1–56
Deferrari, R.J. et al., *A concordance of Ovid* (Washington, 1939)
Del Rio, M.A., *Lucii Annaei Senecae tragoedias amplissima adversaria quae loco commentarii esse possunt* (Antwerp, 1576)
Denniston, J.W., Page, D., *Aeschylus Agamemnon* (Oxford, 1957)
Dickison, S.K., 'Abortion in Antiquity' [Review of Nardi (1971)], *Arethusa* 6 (1973), 159–66
Diggle, J., 'Ovidiana', *PCPhS* 18 (1972), 31–41
Di Lorenzo, E. et al., *Heroides Epistola XIII* (Salerno, Edisud, 1992)
Dilthey, C., *De Callimachi Cydippa* (Leipzig, 1863)
Dindorf, G., *Euripidis Tragoediae superstites et deperditarum fragmenta* (Oxford, 1832–40)
Dörrie, H., *Untersuchungen zur Überlieferungsgeschichte von Ovids epistulae Heroidum* (Göttingen, 1960)
——, 'Die dichterische Absicht Ovids in den Epistulae Heroidum', A&A 13 (1967), 41–55
——, *P. Ovidius Naso: Der Brief der Sappho an Phaon* (Munich, 1975)
Dryden, J. et al., *Ovid's Epistles, translated by several Hands* (London, 1680)
Ehwald, R., 'Exegetischer Kommentar zur XIV Heroide Ovids', *Programm des Herzoglichen Gymnasium Ernestinum Zu Gotha* 1900, 1–26
Enk, P.J., *Plauti Truculentus cum prolegomenis, notis criticis, commentario exegetico, Pars altera, commentarium continens* (Leiden, 1953)
Fantham, E., *Lucan De Bello Civili Book II* (Cambridge, 1992)
Fedeli, P., *Il Carme 61 Di Catullo* (Fribourg, 1972)
Fordyce, C.J., *Catullus: a commentary* (Oxford, 1961)
——, *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Libri VII–VIII* (Oxford, 1977)
Fraenkel, E., *Agamemnon* (Oxford, 1950)
Fränkel, H., *Ovid: a poet between two worlds* (Berkeley, 1945)
Frécaut, J.-M., *L'espirit et l'humour chez Ovid* (Grenoble, 1972)
Ganzenmüller, C., 'Aus Ovids Werkstatt', *Philologus* 70 (1911), 274–311, 397–437
Garvie, A.F., *Aeschylus' Supplices: Play and Trilogy* (Cambridge, 1969)
Giangrande, L., 'Latin Contributions', *Eranos* 64 (1966), 153–60
Goldberg, C., *Carmina Priapea* (Heidelberg, 1992)
Goold, G.P., '[Review:] Ovidii Epistulae Heroidum Ed. Dörrie', *Gnomon* 46 (1974), 475–84
Greenidge, A.H.J., *The legal procedure of Cicero's time* (Oxford, 1901)
Griffith, M., *Aeschylus Prometheus Bound* (Cambridge, 1983)
Gronovius, *Observationum libri tres*, vol. I (Leiden, 1639)
Hahne, E.A., 'The Supposed Reflexive Pronoun in Latin', *TAPhA* 94 (1963), 86–112
Hall, J.B., 'Conjectures in Ovid's Heroides' *ICS* 15 (1990), 263–92
Halleran, M.R., *Euripides Hippolytus* (Warminster, 1995)
Hardie, P., *Virgil Aeneid Book IX* (Cambridge, 1994)
Harmon, A.M., 'Protesilaudamia Laevii', *AJP* 33 (1912), 186–94
Harrison, S.J., *Vergil Aeneid 10* (Oxford, 1991)
Haupt, M., Ehwald, R., *Ovid, Die Metamorphosen* (Berlin, 1915–6)
Haupt, C.G., *Aeschylarum quaestionem specimen secundum* (Leipzig, 1829)
Heinze, T., *P Ovidius Naso Der XII. Heroidenbrief: Medea an Jason* (Leiden, 1997)
Henderson, A.A.R., *Remedia Amoris* (Edinburgh, 1979)
Herescu, N.I., 'Poétique ancienne et moderne au sujet de l'euphonie', in *Mélanges à J. Marouzeau* (Paris, 1948), pp. 221–47
——, 'Les "decem menses" et les calculs chronologiques des Romains', *REL* 33 (1955) 152–65
Hermann, G., *Euripidis Alcestis, cum delectis adnotationibus. potissimum J.H. Monkii. Accedunt emendationes G. Hermanni* (Leipzig, 1824)

Hermann, J.G.J., *Opuscula* (Leipzig, 1827–39)
Hershbell, J.P., *Pseudo-Plato, Axiochus* (Chico California, 1981)
Heusinger, J.F., 'Heroidum Ovidianarum emendationes Guelpherbytanae ad Harlesium', *Lessings Beiträge zur Geschichte und Litteratur* 3 (1774), 1–112
Hinds, S., *Allusion and Intertext—dynamics of appropriation in Roman poetry* (Cambridge, 1998)
Hollis, A.S., *Metamorphoses of Ovid. Book VIII* (Oxford, 1970)
——, *Ovid Ars Amatoria Book 1* (Oxford, 1977)
——, *Callimachus Hecale* (Oxford, 1990)
van Hook, L., 'The exposure of infants at Athens', *TAPhA* 51 (1920), 134–45
Hopkinson, N., *Callimachus Hymn to Demeter* (Cambridge, 1984)
Horsfall, N., 'Virgil and the illusory footnote', *PLLS* 6 (1990), 49–63
Housman, A.E., 'Horatiana', *JPh* 18 (1890), 1–35; = *Class. Papers* 1.136–61
——, 'Ovid's *Heroides*', *CR* 11 (1897), 200–4; = *Class. Papers* 1.388–95
——, 'Ovid's *Heroides*', *CR* 11 (1897), 238–42; = Diggle, J., Goodyear, F.R.D., edd., *The Classical Papers of A.E. Housman* (Cambridge, 1972), vol. 1 pp. 396–403; = Housman (1897a)
——, 'Ovid's *Heroides*', *CR* 11 (1897), 286–90; = *Class. Papers* 1.404–11; = Housman (1897b)
——, 'Lucretiana', *JPh* 25 (1897), 226–49; = *Class. Papers* 2.423–41; = Housman (1897c)
——, 'Review: A. Palmer, *P. Ovidi Nasonis Heroides*', CR 13 (1899), 172–8; = *Class. Papers* 2.470–80
——, 'Ovid, *Art. Am.* I 337', *CR* 16 (1902), 442–6; = *Class. Papers* 2.577–582
——, 'The *Silvae* of Statius', *CR* 20 (1906), 37–47; = *Class. Papers* 2.637–55
——, 'Greek Nouns in Latin Poetry from Lucretius to Juvenal', *JPh* 31 (1910), 236–66; = *Class. Papers* 2.817–39
——, *M. Manilii Astronomicon. Liber Quartus* (London, 1920)
——, 'The application of thought to textual criticism', *PCA* 18 (1922), 67–84; = *Class. Papers* 3.1058–69
——, *M. Annaei Lucani Belli Civilis libri decem* (Oxford, 1926)
——, 'Review: H. Bornecque and M. Prévost, Ovide, Héroides', *CR* 43 (1929), 194–7; = *Class. Papers* 3.1158–62
——, *M. Manilii Astronomicon. Liber Primus, Editio Altera* (Cambridge, 1937)
Hubertinus, Clericus, Crescentinas, *Hubertini Clerici Crescentinatis in Nasonis Heroidas Commentum* (Milan, 1490)
Hunter, R.L., *The New Comedy of Greece and Rome* (Cambridge, 1985)
Isbell, H., *Ovid Heroides, translated with introductions and notes* (London, 1990)
Jacobson, H., *Ovid's Heroides* (Princeton, 1974)
Jackel, S., 'The 14th Heroid letter of Ovid and the Danaid trilogy of Aeschylus', *Menmos.* 26 (1973), 239–48
Jebb, R.C., *Sophocles. The Plays and Fragments. Part III* (Cambridge, 1888)
Johansen, H.F., Whittle, E.W., *Aeschylus The Suppliants* (Copenhagen, 1980)
Jolivet, J.-C., 'Philologie et Mythologie dans la XIII[e] Héroide', *REL* 70 (1992), 138–48
Jouan, F., *Euripide et les Légendes des Chants Cypriens* (Paris, 1966)
Juvencius, J., *Quintus Horatius Flaccus* (Rome, 1838)
Kay, N.M., *Martial Book XI—a commentary* (London, 1985)
Keller, O., *Pseudacronis scholia in Horatium vetustiora*, vol. II (Leipzig, 1904)
Kennedy, D.F., 'The epistolary mode and the first of Ovid's Heroides', *CQ* 34 (1984), 413–22
Kenney, E.J., 'Nequitiae poeta', in Herescu, N.I., ed., *Ovidiana—recherches sur Ovide* (Paris, 1958), pp. 201–9
——, 'Notes on Ovid: II,' *CQ* 9 (1959), 240–60

——, [Review of Dörrie (1960)], *Gnomon* 33 (1961), 478–87
——, 'Ovid and the Law', *YCS* 21 (1969), 243–63
——, 'Novavit Opus' [Review of Kirfel (1969)], *CR* 20 (1970), 195–7
——, 'Notes on Ovid: III', *HSPh* 74 (1970), 169–85, = Kenney (1970a)
——, *Apuleius—Cupid and Psyche* (Cambridge, 1990)
Kirfel, E.A., *Untersuchungen zur Briefform der Heroiden Ovids* (*Noctes Romanae* 11, 1969)
Kirk, G.S., *The Iliad: a commentary*, vol. I *Books 1–4* (Cambridge, 1985)
Knight, W.F.J., 'Iliupersides', *CQ* 26 (1932), 178–89
——, 'Ovid's Metre and Rhythm', in Herescu, N.I., ed., *Ovidiana recherches sur Ovide* (Paris, 1958), pp. 106–20
Lachmann, K., 'De Ovidi Epistulis', Progr. Univ. Berolinense 1848, = *Kleinere Schriften* (Berlin, 1876), vol. 2 pp. 56–61
La Penna, A., 'Le atre faci delle erinii (nota a Ovidio, *Her.* 11,103)', in Citroni, M. et al., ed., *Da Lucrezio a Persio. Saggi, studi, note* (Milan, 1995)
Lattimore, R., *Themes in Greek and Latin Epitaphs* (Urbana, 1942)
Lee, A.G., *Ovid Metamorphoses I* (Cambridge, 1953)
Lehrs, C., 'Adversarien über die sogenannten Ovidischen Heroiden', *NJA* (1863), 49–69
Leumann, M., *Lateinische Laut- und Formenlehre, Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft* 2.21 (Munich, 1963)
Lewis, N., *Papyrus in Classical Antiquity* (Oxford, 1974)
Lindsay, W.M., *The Latin Language an historical account of Latin sounds, stems and flexions* (Oxford, 1894)
——, *Notae Latinae—an account of abbreviation in Latin Mss. of the early miniscule period (c. 700–850)* (Cambridge, 1915)
Lissarrague, F., 'Figures of Women', in Pantel, P.S., ed., Goldhammer, A., trans., *A History of Women in the West*, vol. I *from Ancient Goddesses to Christian Saints* (Harvard, 1992), pp. 139–229
Lloyd-Jones, H., [Review of E.G. Turner et al., *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri 27*], *Gnomon* 35 (1963), 433–55
Loers, V., *Specimen Annotationis in P. Ovidii Nasonis Heroidas* (Triers, 1825)
Lowrie, M., *Horace's Narrative Odes* (Oxford, 1997)
Luck, G., *Untersuchungen zur Textgeschicte Ovids* (Heidelberg, 1969)
Lucke, C., *P. Ovidius Naso Remedia Amoris. Kommentar zu Vers 397–814* (Bonn, 1982)
Luppe, W., 'Ein neue Zeugnis der Danaiden-Sage, P.Oxy. 3702', *ZPE* 66 (1986), 17–8
Lyne, R.O.A.M., *Ciris: a poem attributed to Vergil* (Cambridge, 1978)
——, 'Love and Death: Laodamia and Protesilaus in Catullus, Propertius, and others', *CQ* 48 (1998), 200–12
McGann, M.J., 'The Date of Tibullus' Death', *Latomus* 29 (1970), 774–80
McKeown, J.C., *Ovid: Amores*, vol. I *Text and Prolegomena* (Leeds, 1987)
——, *Ovid: Amores*, vol. II *A commentary on Book One* (Leeds, 1989)
——, *Ovid: Amores*, vol. III *A commentary on Book Two* (Leeds, 1998)
Macleane, A.J., *Quinti Horatii Flacci Opera Omnia, 2nd ed. revised by George Lang* (London, 1869)
MacLeod, M.D., *Lucian—A selection* (Warminster, 1991)
Madvig, J.N., *Adversaria Critica 2* (Copenhagen, 1873)
Magnus, H., *P. Ovidi Nasonis Metamorphosen Libri XV* (Berlin, 1914)
Malherbe, A., *Ancient Epistolary Theorists* (Atlanta, 1988)
Maltby, R., *A Lexicon of Ancient Latin Etymologies* (Leeds, 1991)
Mayer, M., *Der Protesilaus des Euripides*, *Hermes* 20 (1885), 101–34
Merklin, H., 'Arethusa und Laodamia', *Hermes* 96 (1968), 461–94
Meurig Davies, E.L.B., 'Notes on Lucretius, Ovid and Lucan', *Mnemos.* ser. 4 vol. 2 (1949), 72–8

Meyer, H., *Kunst und Geschichte* (Munich, 1983)
Morris, L., 'Heroides' [Review of Knox and Kenney], *CR* 49 (1999), 55–7
Müller, L., 'Kritische Beiträge zu einigen römischen Autoren', *RhM* 17 (1862), 190–5
Munro, H.A.J., *T. Lucreti Cari De Rerum Natura Libri Sex*, 4th ed., revised (London, Cambridge, 1886)
Murgatroyd, P., *Tibullus I* (Natal, 1980)
Murphy, G.M.H., *Ovid Metamorphoses XI* (Oxford, 1972)
Murray, R.D., Jr., *The motif of Io in Aeschylus' Suppliants* (Princeton, 1958)
Mynors, R.A.B., *Virgil Georgics* (Oxford, 1990)
Nardi, E., *Procurato aborto nel mondo greco romano* (Milan, 1971)
Naylor, H.D., 'Notes on Ovid's Heroides I–XIV', *CR* 21 (1907), 43–4
Nisbet, R.G.M., Hubbard, M., *A Commentary on Horace: Odes, Book I* (Oxford, 1970)
——, Hubbard, M., *A Commentary on Horace: Odes, Book II* (Oxford, 1978)
Nissen, T., Übersehene Lesarten zu Ovids Heroïden, *Hermes* 76 (1941), 87–93
Norden, E., *P. Vergilius Maros Aeneis Buch VI, Dritte Auflage* (Leipzig, Berlin, 1926)
Ogle, M.B., 'The House-Door in Greek and Roman Religion and Folk-Lore', *AJPh* 32 (1911), 251–71
O'Hara, J.J., *True Names—Vergil and the Alexandrian Tradition of Etymological Wordplay* (Michigan, 1996)
Opie, I., Tatem, M., *A dictionary of superstition* (Oxford, 1989)
Oppel, E., *Ovids Heroides: Studien zur inneren Form und zur Motivation*, Diss. Erlangen-Nürnberg 1968
Otis, B., *Virgil: A Study in Civilized Poetry* (Oxford, 1964)
——, *Ovid as an Epic Poet*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge, 1970)
Page, D.L., 'Archilochus and the oral tradition', in *Archiloque: sept exposés et discussions Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique, tome X* (Geneva, 1964), pp. 117–179
Paley, F.A., *Euripides. With an English Commentary*, vol. I (London, 1857)
——, *The Iliad of Homer* (London, 1866–71)
——, *Sex. Aurelii Propertii Carmina. The elegies of Propertius, with English notes, 2nd ed.* (London, 1872)
——, *On Quintus Smyrnaeus and the 'Homer' of the tragic poets* (Cambridge, 1876)
——, Stone, W.H., *M. Val. Martialis Epigrammata Selecta* (London, 1905)
Parker, R., *Miasma: Pollution and Purification in Early Greek Religion* (Oxford, 1982)
Pearson, A.C., *The Helena of Euripides* (Cambridge, 1903)
Pease, A.S., *M. Tulli Ciceronis de Divinatione Liber Secundus* (Illinois, 1923)
——, *Publi Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Liber Quartus* (Cambridge Mass., 1935)
——, *M. Tulli Ciceronis De Natura Deorum*, vol. II (Cambridge Mass., Harvard, 1958)
Perrot, J., *Les dérivés Latins en -men et -mentum* (Paris, 1961)
Peters, W., *Observationes ad P. Ovidii Nasonis Her. Epistulas* (Diss. Phil. Leipzig, 1882)
Postgate, J.P., *Corpus Poetarum Latinorum, Editio altera emendatior* (London, 1894–1905)
Pulbrook, M., 'The Original Published Form of Ovid's *Heroides*', *Hermathena* 122 (1977), 29–45
Putnam, M.C.J., *Tibullus: A commentary* (Oklahoma, 1973)
Quinn, K., *Horace The Odes* (Basingstoke, New York, 1980)
Reeve, M.D., 'Notes on Ovid's *Heroides*', *CQ* 23 (1973), 324–38
——, 'Ovid's Heroides' [Review of Dörrie], *CR* 24 (1974), 57–64
Rehm, R., *Marriage to Death: the conflation of wedding and funeral rituals in Greek Tragedy* (Princeton, 1994)
Reynolds, L.D., Wilson, N.G., *Scribes and Scholars—A guide to the transmission of Greek and Latin literature, 2nd ed. Revised and enlarged* (Oxford, 1974)
Riddle, J.M., *Contraception and Abortion from the Ancient World to the Renaissance* (Cambridge Mass., 1992)
Room, A., *NTC's Classical Dictionary: the origins of the names of characters in classical mythology* (Illinois, 1990)

Rosati, G., 'Aeolis Aeolidae . . . sull'autenticità di un distico ovidiano (*Her.* 11, 0a–b)', *RFIC* 112 (1984), 417–26
Roscher, W.H., *Ausführliches lexicon der griechischen und romischen Mythologie* (Leipzig, 1884–1937)
Rose, H.J., 'Euripides, *Alcestis* 340ff.', *CR* 41 (1927), 58
Rudd, N., *Horace Epistles Book II and Epistle to the Pisones ('Ars Poetica')* (Cambridge, 1989)
Ruhnken, D., *Dictata ad Ovidii Heroidas et Albinovani Elegiam, ed. Friedemann, F.T* (Frankfurt, 1831)
Ryzman, M., 'The psychological role of Danaus in Aeschylus' Supplices', *Eranos* (1989), 1–6
Sabot, A.F., *Ovide, poète de l'amour dans ses oeuvres de jeunesse* (Paris, 1976)
——, 'Les Héroïdes d'Ovide; préciosité, rhetorique et poésie', *ANRW* 2, 31.4 (1981), 2552–2636
Sandys, J.E., *The Bacchae of Euripides, 4th ed.* (Cambridge, 1900)
Schliemann, H., *Troy and its remains—a narrative of researches and discoveries made on the site of Ilium, and in the Trojan plain* (London, 1875)
——, *Ilios the city and country of the Trojans* (London, 1881)
Schmitz-Cronenbroech, W., *Die Anfänge der Heroiden des Ovid* (Diss. Phil. Cologne, 1937)
Schroeder, O., *Pindari Carmina* (Leipzig, 1900)
Seaford, R., 'The Tragic Wedding', *JHS* 107 (1987), 106–30
——, 'The imprisonment of women in Greek Tragedy', *JHS* 110 (1990), 76–90
Shepherd, W.G., *Propertius—the poems* (Harmondsworth, 1985)
Shipton, K.M.W., 'No alternative to ceremonial negligence', *SO* 62 (1987), 51–68
Smith, K.F., *The elegies of Albius Tibullus—The corpus Tibullianum, edited with introduction and notes on Books 1, 2 and 4.2–14* (New York, Cincinnati, c. 1913)
Smolenaars, J.J.L., *Statius Thebaid VII: a Commentary* (Leiden, 1994)
Solodow, J.B., 'Raucae, tua cura, palumbes: a study of a poetic word order', *HSPh* 90 (1986), 129–53
——, The world of Ovid's Metamorphoses (North Carolina, 1988)
Soubiran, J., L'élision dans la poésie latine (Paris, 1966)
Spoth, F., *Ovids Heroides als Elegien* (Munich, 1992)
Stroh, 'Heroides Ovidianae cur epistulas scribant', in Papponetti, G., ed., *Ovidio poeta della memoria* (Rome, 1991), pp. 201–44
Tarrant, R.J., *Seneca Agamemnon* (Cambridge, 1976)
——, 'The Authenticity of the letter of Sappho to Phaon', *HSPh* 85 (1981), 133–53
——, 'Ovid', in Reynolds, L.D., ed., *Texts and transmission. A survey of the Latin classics* (Oxford, 1983), pp. 257–84
Thomas, R.F., 'An alternative to ceremonial negligence (Cat. 68.73–78)', *HSPh* 82 (1978), 175–8
——, *Virgil Georgics.* Vol. 2: *Books III–IV* (Cambridge, 1988)
Timpanaro, S., *Contributi di filologia e di storia della lingua latina* (Rome, 1978)
Traill, D.A., *Schliemann of Troy—Treasure and Deceit* (London, 1995)
Treggiari, S., *Roman Marriage: Iusti Coniuges from the Time of Cicero to the Time of Ulpian* (Oxford, 1991)
Tyrrell, R.Y., Purser, L.C., *The Correspondance of M. Tullius Cicero, 3rd ed.* (Dublin, London, 1904–33)
Vahlen, J., 'Varia', *Hermes* 17 (1882), 268–278
——, 'Über die Anfänge der Heroiden', AbhAkadBerlin (1881); = *Gesammelte philologische Schriften, II: Schriften der Berliner Zeit, 1874–1911* (Leipzig, 1923), pp. 72–112
Verducci, F., *Ovid's Toyshop of the Heart: Epistulae Heroidum* (Princeton, 1985)
Watson, P., '*Puella* and *Virgo*', *Glotta* 61 (1983), 119–43
Watt, W.S., 'Ovidiana', *MH* 42 (1985), 56–60

——, 'Ovidiana', *MH* 52 (1995), 90–107
Webster, T.B.L., *Monuments illustrating tragedy and satyr play, 2nd ed.* (London, 1967)
Welcker, F.G., *Die Aeschylische Trilogie Prometheus* (Darmstadt, 1824)
West, M.L., *Textual Criticism and Editorial Technique applicable to Greek and Latin Texts* (Stuttgart, 1973)
West, D.A., Woodman, A.J., edd., *Creative Imitation and Latin Literature* (Cambridge, 1979)
Wiedemann, T.E.J., *Adults and Children in the Roman Empire* (London, 1989)
von Wilamowitz-Möllendorf, U., *Kleine Schriften* (Berlin, 1935–1962)
Wilkinson, L.P., 'The World of the Metamorphoses', in Herescu, N.I., ed., *Ovidiana—recherches sur Ovide* (Paris, 1958), pp. 231–44
——, *Ovid recalled* (Cambridge, 1955)
Williams, G., 'Ovid's Canace', *CQ* 42 (1992), 201–9
Williams, R.D., *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos liber quintus* (Oxford, 1960)
Willink, C.W., *Euripides Orestes* (Oxford, 1986)
Wills, J., *Repetition in Latin Poetry, Figures of Allusion* (Oxford, 1996)
Winnington-Ingram, R.P., 'Two Latin Idioms', *CR* 5 (1955), 139–41
——, 'The Danaid Trilogy of Aeschylus', *JHS* 81 (1961), 141–52

INDEXES*

* References are to lemmata in the commentary. Where n. follows the reference number, the information is to be found in the footnotes for that lemma.

1. LATIN WORDS

a!: 13.4, 13.108
abripere: 13.15
Acastus: 13.25–6
accipere: 13.118
addere: 14.126
adducere: 11.29
adesse: 14.27–8
admittere: 11.23, 11.108, 11.109–10
admonitus: 14.17
admovere: 11.45–6
aeger: 11.39–40
Aeolis: 11.7
agere: 14.120
altus: 14.33–4
amittere: 11.109–10
amplexus: 13.7ff., 14.69
animus: 13.83
annus: 14.110
aperire: 13.30n.
aptus: 13.119
Arethusis: 13.61
Argos: 14.34
arma: 14.98
arripere: 13.15
ars: 11.45–6
Astydamia: 13.25–6
auctor: 11.7
audax: 11.41

Belides: 14.21, 14.73
bellare: 13.69
bellum: 13.63–6
bene: 11.109–10, 13.113–20, 14.11
bicorniger: 13.33–4
bicornis: 13.33–4
bracchium: 14.69
-bundus: 11.83

cadere: 14.122
caecus 11.3–4
caedes: 11.3–4, 14.79
caespes: 14.96
calamus: 11.4–6
capere: 13.118
caput: 13.159–60
carens: 13.108
carpere: 13.118
castus: 13.30, 14.50
cente(n)simus: 14.121
Cephisis: 13.61
charta: 11.4–6
cibus: 11.30, 14.33
cogere: 11.30
coma: 14.39–40
combibere: 11.56
comes: 13.161–2
committere: 11.23, 14.63–4
concurrere: 13.79–82
condere: 11.100
conlucere: 14.25–8
conscius: 11.52
consistere: 14.72
consors: 13.61
conubia: 11.101
corniger: 13.33–4
corpus: 13.146, 13.159–60
credibilis: 14.57–8
crepusculum: 14.22
Cretheis: 13.25–6
crimen: 11.51, 14.2
cum: 11.121
cura: 13.65, 14.123–4

dare: 13.118, 14.42, 14.116, 14.125–6
de tot . . . unus: 13.77–8
de-: 14.5
defendere: 13.55
demittere: 14.5
demum: 11.93
denique: 11.93
denus: 11.48
deponere: 11.66
designare: 13.91–2
di-: 14.5
dicere: 11.61, 13.4
dignus: 14.31–2, 14.32, 14.99, 14.123–4
dimittere: 14.5
dinumerare: 14.80–1
dolor: 11.49, 13.29
domina: 11.4, 13.73–4, 14.59–60
dominus: 11.4, 14.59–60
donare: 11.101
dotare: 11.101
dubius: 14.29–30
ducere: 14.23–4
dum + future indicative: 13.149
Dysparis: 13.43–4

effugere: 14.104
ego: 13.133
emittere: 14.107
ergo: 13.69
erigere: 14.43–4
errare: 11.3–4
-e(n)simus: 14.121
esse: 14.36
et tamen: 14.35–6
ex: 14.79
excutere: 13.109, 14.43–4
exigere: 11.7
exiguus: 14.52, 14.115
expulere: 14.72
exuere: 14.108
exul: 14.129–30

facere: 13.69, 13.90, 13.135ff., 13.147–8, 14.56, 14.63–4, 14.94
facilis: 11.31
falsus: 13.105–8
fatigare: 13.96
fax: 11.103–6, 13.158
femina: 14.55
ferre: 11.103–6, 13.37–40, 13.83, 14.31–2
ferreus: 13.63–6
ferus: 14.56
fidelis: 14.127–8
fieri: 13.147–8
flebilis: 13.47–8
fortis: 13.79–82
frater: 11.89, 14.1, 14.95, 14.123–4
fraxinus (adjective): 11.78
fraxinus (noun): 11.78
frequens: 14.29–30
fretum: 13.121ff.
frigidus: 14.37–8
frux: 11.69
fugere: 13.4, 13.7ff., 14.104
funebris: 11.21
funus: 14.31–2
furor: 13.29
furtivus: 11.40
futurus: 11.63

gaudium: 13.105–8n.
Gelanor: 14.23–4
gerere: 13.37–40
germanus: 11.89, 14.53–4
gracilis: 14.39–40
grandaevus: 13.25–6
gravis: 14.33–4, 14.33
gremium: 11.6

Haemonis: 13.1–2
Haemonius: 13.1–2
Hellanor: 14.23–4
hic: 13.61–2, 13.90
Hippolyte: 13.25–6
hospes: 13.43–4
hostis: 13.43–4
Hypermestra: 14.1
Hypermestre: 14.1

iacere: 11.6, 14.2
iactare: 14.69
iactura: 14.80–1
iaculatrix: 13.13
ignis: 14.9
ille: 13.14, 14.85–6, 14.95
imago: 11.7
immanis: 11.18
immunis: 14.8
in: 14.80–1
in unum: 11.23
Inachis: 14.105
incumbere: 11.59–64, 11.117–20
indignus: 11.95
iners: 13.43–4, 14.75
inertia: 14.75
infans (adjective): 11.121
infans (noun): 11.45–6, 11.121
infelix: 14.93
infestus: 11.21
inpedire: 13.29
insuper: 14.126
invidere: 13.135
Io: 14.103
io: 14.103
Iphiclus: 13.25–6
ipse: 13.159–60, 14.23–4
ire: 11.94, 13.1–2, 13.102
irritus: 13.90
iste: 11.97–8, 14.53–4, 14.73–8
Iunonius: 14.85
iustus: 11.117–20

labrum: 13.108, 13.119
lacrima: 11.56, 13.111
laena: 13.37–40
lampas: 14.25–8
languor: 13.113–20
laniare: 14.51
Laodamia: 13.2
lassus: 13.135ff., 14.131–2
laus: 14.120
Led(a)eis: 13.61

Ledaeus: 13.61
legitimus: 13.30
lenis: 14.39
letum: 14.116
levis: 14.39
lingua: 13.14, 13.120
loqui: 14.91
Lynceus: 14.123

madidus: 14.29 30
male: 14.45–6
mandare: 11.129–30, 13.7ff., 13.13
mandatrix: 13.13
mane erat: 14.79
manus: 13.63–6, 14.5
marita: 13.45–6
mater: 11.64, 13.35
-men: 13.133
miles: 11.50
mille(n)simus: 14.121
mittere: 14.1–2, 14.1
modo 14.1, 14.88, 14.99
mollis: 14.56
mora: 13.120, 13.127 130
mordere: 13.29
movere: 11.48
multus: 13.63–6, 13.68, 13.108
munus: 11.21, 14.123–4
murex: 13.37 40
mutus: 13.108

nam: 11.90
nescioquis: 11.28, 13.63 6, 13.91 2, 13.91
nex: 14.125–6
nimium: 11.129
nisi/ni: 14.74
nisi si: 13.55
nocere: 13.61–2
nos: 13.147–8, 14.127 8
novatrix: 13.13
novus: 11.50
nox: 14.73–8
nudus: 13.79–82, 14.100
num minus: 11.21
numen: 13.159–60n.

obsistere: 13.5
occumbere: 13.29n.
officium: 13.140
oliva: 11.69
omen: 13.49 50
opponere: 13.79–82
ops: 13.57–8
optare: 13.1–2
opus: 11.7
oriri: 11.47, 14.18
osculum: 13.7ff., 13.118
ossa: 14.18

paelex: 14.95
pallens: 13.105–8
pallor: 13.105–8
pangere: 14.82
patruelis: 14.61
pectus: 13.146
Pelasgus: 14.21
pererrare: 14.103
perfect tense: 11.116, 14.46, 14.72
perferre: 11.129–30
perire: 14.117
permanere: 14.85
persequi: 11.129–30
petere: 13.29
Phrygius: 13.57–8
Phylaceis: 13.35
Phylleis: 13.35
Phylleius: 13.35
Phylleus: 13.35
pius/pietas: 14.4, 14.123 4
placere: 11.7
plangi: 11.93
plecto: 11.112
plenus: 11.48
pondus: 11.39–40
ponere: 11.66
populus: 14.115
porta: 14.107
portus: 14.107
posse: 14.19
praecingere: 14.25–8
praemium: 14.84
praepedire: 14.18
premere: 11.52
pretium: 14.129–30
Priamides: 13.61
producere: 13.135ff.
promptus: 13.120
pronus: 11.48
prosequi: 11.121
prosilire: 13.29
pudor: 11.81
pugnare: 13.69, 13.75

-que: 13.76, 14.42, 14.67, 14.91, 14.125 6

querela: 13.108, 14.67, 14.127–8
queri: 13.108, 13.149ff., 14.67, 14.91
qui/qua/quam + *posse*: 13.41
qui: 13.135, 14.85–6
quid . . . cum: 14.65–6
quies: 14.33–4
quin age: 14.57–8
quis + partitive genitive: 11.89
quisque: 13.60, 13.63–6, 13.128
quo: 14.65–6
quoque: 13.71–2
quotus: 13.60
quotuscumque: 13.60
quotusquisque: 13.60

rabidus: 11.113
rapere: 13.73–4, 13.118
rapidus: 11.113
re-: 13.49–50, 14.46
rec(c)idere: 14.46
recurrere: 13.88
recursus: 13.88
redux: 13.49–50
referre: 13.159–60, 14.46
reficere: 13.25–6, 13.120
regnum: 14.111–2
relucere: 13.111
relucescere: 13.111
repellere: 14.46
reperire: 14.46
repre(he)ndere: 11.55
reservare: 14.119
resistere: 13.119
resolvere: 13.145
retinere: 13.120
reus: 14.120
reverti: 13.88
revocamen: 13.133
rogare: 11.129–30
rudis: 11.50

sacer: 14.82
salus: 13.1–2
sanguineus: 13.63–6
sanguinolentus: 14.60
sanguis: 14.17
satelles: 11.95
scilicet ex illo . . . manet: 14.85
scilicet: 13.37–40, 14.85
sculpere/scalpere: 14.127–8
se: 13.73–4
senectus: 14.109
Sestis: 13.61
Sestus: 13.61
si: 13.135
sic: 13.135
signare: 13.63–6
simulacrum: 13.109–12
sinus: 13.149ff.
sistere gradum/pedem: 13.89–90
Sithonis: 13.61
Sithonius: 11.15–6
solvere: 11.6, 13.12–4, 13.113–20
somnus: 11.31, 13.109, 14.33–4, 14.33, 14.72
sonus: 13.149ff.n.
soror: 11.89, 14.1, 14.95, 14.123–4
spargere: 13.111
spectabilis: 13.57–8
spectare: 13.149ff.
speratus: 11.123
stare: 14.72
stratum/torum premere: 14.31–2
stupefactus: 14.97
sub-: 11.42
subicere: 11.42
sumere: 13.118
summa: 14.80–1
superincumbo: 11.59–64
supponere: 11.41, 11.42
suus: 14.67, 14.90

tacite: 13.69
tacito: 13.69
tacitus: 13.69
Taenaris: 13.45–6, 13.61
Taenarius: 13.45–6
talis: 14.52
tamen: 11.1–2
tecum: 13.159–60
tegere: 11.45–6
tela: 11.22, 13.37–40, 14.65
telum: 11.41, 14.65
temerare: 14.17
tendere: 14.10
tener: 14.87
tenere: 14.61–114
tepidus: 11.78
ter: 14.45–6
titulus: 14.127–8
-trix: 13.13
truculentus: 11.11
trudere: 14.10
tum: 11.93
tumidus: 11.17
tunc: 11.93
turba: 14.2, 14.118
turma: 14.118

turpis: 13.121ff.
Tyndaris: 13.61

ultimus: 14.109, 14.112
umbra: 11.121, 14.93
umquam: 11.25
unus: 14.73
ut . . . ut: 13.87
ut: 11.11, 13.69, 13.159–60
utilis: 13.6

vagitus: 11.73
vale: 13.14
vel: 14.125–6
velle: 13.85
venatrix: 13.13
venire: 13.98–9, 13.102, 13.108
venter: 11.39
ventosus: 11.11
ventus: 13.121ff.
vera fateri: 14.47
verbum: 13.119
vibrare: 14.39–40
victrix: 13.13
videre: 14.35–6
vinum: 14.33
vir: 13.73–4n.
virgo: 14.55
viscus: 11.44, 11.92
vitiare: 11.39
vitta: 11.69
vocare: 13.9–10
vulgus: 14.27
vulnus: 11.127

2. GENERAL

abortion: 11.41, 11.42, 11.43, 11.44, 11.45–6, 14.122
accusative of respect: 14.51
Aegyptus
  accompanies/does not accompany sons to Argos: 14.23–4
  flees Argos: 14.23–4
  kingdom: 14.61
  quarrel with Danaus: 14.61–114, 14.61, 14.111, 14.111–2
Aeolus, father of Canace
  attitude towards incest: 11.23–6
  changeable: 11.11
  cruel: 11.9–10
  identified with Aeolus, ruler of winds: 11.11
  significance of name: 11.11
  size of kingdom: 11.18
Aeolus, lost play by Euripides: 11.1–2, 11.11, 11.15–6, 11.19–20, 11.23–6, 11.27, 11.35, 11.41, 11.47ff., 11.69ff., 11.81, 11.85–6, 11.93–4, 11.97–8, 11.101, 11.109–10, 11.113, 11.117–20, 11.125–6
'Alexandrian footnote': *see* self-reflexive markers, signals of allusion, and 'Alexandrian footnotes'
allegory: 14.69–70, 14.85–108
alliteration: 11.13, 11.21–2, 11.21, 11.25, 11.93, 13.5, 13.53–4, 13.69, 13.129, 14.14, 14.15, 14.53–4, 14.87, 14.129–30
anacoluthon: 13.161–2
anadiplosis: *see* epanalepsis
anknüpfend: 11.90
archetype, evidence for thirteen-line page in: 14.61–114
arguments *e minore*: 14.120

Boreas: 13.15

Canace
  ancestry: 11.19–20
  attitude towards incest: 11.23–6, 11.29–34, 11.51
  birth of child: 11.45–6, 11.47ff.
  children by Poseidon: 11.19–20
  complicity in love-affair: 11.27 (*see also* Macareus, as violent seducer)
  extent of reader's sympathy towards: 11.41, 11.44, 11.69ff., 11.109–10, 11.117–20
  full sister of Macareus: 11.89
  home: 11.15–6
  naiveté and ignorance: 11.8, 11.27, 11.28, 11.29–34, 11.62, 11.63–4, 11.83, 11.101, 11.123
  pudor: 11.39, 11.81, 11.83
  resolved to die: 11.3–4, 11.24, 11.57, 11.58
  sexual language: 11.6, 11.23, 11.39
  slave-name: 11.7
closure: 11.123, 11.129–30, 13.163–4, 14.131–2
conditional clauses
  indicative replaces subjunctive in apodosis: 11.58, 13.56
  tense of verbs: 11.58, 13.56, 14.74
contracted verbs: 11.55, 11.61, 13.161–2, 14.46
controversia: 14.52
criminal responsibility, age of: 11.111

Danaid trilogy, cycle of plays by Aeschylus (*Supplices*, extant; *Aegyptii* and *Danaides*, lost): 14.3, 14.4, 14.5, 14.6–7, 14.9, 14.15, 14.23–4, 14.25–8, 14.52, 14.61–114, 14.67–70, 14.71, 14.73, 14.79–80, 14.85–108, 14.85, 14.87, 14.88, 14.91, 14.93, 14.95, 14.96, 14.101–2, 14.101, 14.103, 14.107, 14.109–10, 14.111–2, 14.111, 14.111–2, 14.126
Danaids
  bold/fierce: 14.5–6, 14.15, 14.118
  connection with Io: 14.85–108, 14.85
  famous myth: 14.1–2
  flee from Egypt: 14.109ff., 14.111–2, 14.111, 14.111–2,
  impiae: 14.4
  in underworld: 14.15
  invent wedding-cry: 14.27
  marriages with grooms (un)consummated: 14.33

murder-weapon: 14.5
purified of blood-guilt: 14.15, 14.126
re-marry: 14.15
trial and reconciliation: 14.4, 14.15, 14.125–6
war in Argos: 14.111
war in Egypt: 14.111
Danais, lost epic: 14.111
Danaus
appeals to *pietas* of daughters: 14.4
calculating: 14.79–80, 14.80–1
kingdom: 14.61
overbearing father: 14.9, 14.44, 14.47, 14.71, 14.89–90
quarrel: *see* Aegyptus, quarrel with Danaus
sails first pentekonter: 14.80–1
trial: *see* Danaids, trial and reconciliation
Demeter: 11.69ff.
'distancing':
part of body stands for the individual: 11.39–40, 11.40, 13.14, 14.5, 14.13, 14.18, 14.19–20, 14.45–6, 14.50 14.131–2
third person stands for first person: 11.129–30, 13.1–2, 14.1–2
dramatic irony: *see* readership knowledge and dramatic irony
Dryden, John: 11.17, 11.21, 11.39, 11.52, 11.59–64, 11.67, 11.85–6, 11.100

echoes, internal: 11.12, 11.44, 11.83, 11.109–10, 11.117–20, 11.123, 11.127, 13.98–9, 13.113–20, 13.121ff., 13.135ff., 13.149ff., 14.1, 14.85–108, 14.88, 14.91, 14.92, 14.93, 14.94, 14.95, 14.101, 14.104
ellipse: 11.34, 11.90, 13.60, 13.111, 13.133, 13.135, 14.5, 14.31–2, 14.42, 14.57–8, 14.65–6 (*see also* parataxis)
epanalepsis: 13.10–11, 13.73–4, 13.139–40
epistolarity
epistolary formulae: 11.1–2, 13.1–2, 13.163–4, 14.1–2
epistolary tenses: 11.12
references to writing process: 11.4–6, 13.163–4, 14.19–20, 14.131–2
etymological play: 11.3–4, 11.11, 13.89–90, 13.91–2, 13.129, 14.49–50, 14.73–8, 14.103

female loquacity: 13.8
florilegia, penchant for gnomic statements: 11.63, 13.147–8, 14.4
forensic terminology: 13.30, 13.61, 14.61–114, 14.63–4, 14.119–20, 14.119, 14.120
Furies
accoutrements of: 11.103–6, 11.105
dark: 11.105
future tense: 13.37–40, 13.149, 14.74, 14.120

genitive
after *mora*: 13.127–130
'consisting in' or sim.: 14.42
genitive adjective or participle and possessive adjective: 11.79
genitive participle of possessor with *mei* understood: 11.52, 13.13
object genitive of personal pronoun with agreeing adjective: 11.108
of offence: 14.120
partitive: 11.89
subject genitive after *cura*: 13.65
gestation period, duration of: 11.48
grammarians, ancient, at odds with poets: 11.18, 11.89
Greek forms: 11.7, 11.15–6, 13.1–2, 13.2, 13.25–6, 13.35, 13.43–4, 13.45–6, 13.61, 13.135, 14.1, 14.34, 14.73, 14.105, 14.123

hairstyles: 13.31–2
Housman, A.E., acerbic judgements on others: 11.78, 11.129–30, 13.73–4, 13.108, 13.135, 13.139–40, 14.42, 14.73, 14.103
hyperbole: 11.85–6, 13.28, 13.119, 14.111, 14.117, 14.129–30
Hypermestra
appeals for rescue: 14.42, 14.55, 14.69–70, 14.83, 14.85–108, 14.89, 14.109ff., 14.123–4, 14.125–6, 14.127–8, 14.129–30, 14.131–2
asserts *pietas*: 14.4, 14.83, 14.123–4
buried with Lynceus: 14.127–8
defended by Venus/Aphrodite: 14.4, 14.15, 14.73–8

feelings for husband/motives for sparing him, 14.1–2, 14.1, 14.4, 14.5–6, 14.12, 14.19–20, 14.33, 14.42, 14.49–50, 14.69–70, 14.71, 14.123–4, 14.125–6, 14.127–8
heroic: 14.12, 14.109ff., 14.122, 14.123–4, 14.125–6, 14.127–8, 14.129–30
reserved/elliptical: 14.1–2, 14.1, 14.2, 14.5, 14.12, 14.19–20, 14.19, 14.31–2, 14.35–6, 14.41–50, 14.42, 14.45–6, 14.45, 14.49–50, 14.52, 14.55, 14.69–70, 14.71, 14.73–8, 14.83, 14.85–108, 14.86, 14.107, 14.109–10, 14.116, 14.123–4, 14.125–6, 14.129–30
helplessness/cowardice: 14.5, 14.6, 14.109ff., 14.131–2
identification with Io: 14.85–108, 14.87, 14.88, 14.89, 14.92, 14.93, 14.94, 14.95, 14.98, 14.100, 14.101, 14.104, 14.109–10, 14.111–2, 14.112
imprisonment: 14.3, 14.6–7, 14.119–20
marriage with Lynceus (un)consummated: 14.4, 14.33, 14.42, 14.50, 14.55, 14.69–70, 14.75, 14.123–4
praised by poets: 14.6
rebukes/criticises Lynceus: 14.69–70, 14.75, 14.109ff., 14.115, 14.121–2, 14.129–30
sole Danaid to spare husband: 14.1
trial and acquittal: 14.6–7, 14.52, 14.109ff., 14.119–20, 14.120, 14.125–6
wealthy princess: 14.51–2, 14.61–114, 14.100
hypotheses, unreliable: 11.35

iconography, representation of heroines in: 11.7, 11.23–6, 13.7ff., 13.23–4, 13.25–6, 13.31–2, 13.33–4, 14.2, 14.4, 14.52, 14.67–70, 14.125–6
Ida: 13.53–4
image of beloved: 13.149ff.
imperative equivalent to protasis of conditional clause: 14.125–6
imperfect tense: 11.39, 11.69ff., 14.36, 14.71, 14.99
incest: 11.1–2, 11.23–6, 11.29–34, 11.51, 11.61, 11.69ff.
infanticide: 11.85–6

Io
agents of her transformation: 14.87, 14.107, 14.109–10
appearance after metamorphosis: 14.88
birth of son: 14.109–10
connection with Danaids: 14.85–108
deified: 14.86
diet: 14.96, 14.97
dual identity: 14.85–108, 14.89, 14.92, 14.96, 14.105
famous in myth: 14.85–108, 14.95
horns: 14.90
in Calvus: 14.85–108, 14.90, 14.91, 14.93, 14.96, 14.101–2, 14.105
infelix: 14.93
marriage: 14.109–10
niece of the rivers: 14.101
οἰστρηλασία: 14.93, 14.103
unable to speak: 14.91
wanderings: 14.101–2, 14.101, 14.107

Juno
and Argos: 14.27–8
anger of: 14.85
pronuba: 14.27–8

Kalosy, Michael: 13.149ff.

lanificium: 14.66
Laodamia
bacchic rites: 13.33–4, 13.35, 13.36, 13.109–12, 13.149ff., 13.159–60 (*see also* Protesilaus, statue)
companion of her husband in death: 13.1–2, 13.161–2
envies rival: 13.135ff., 13.147–8
erotic dream: 13.105–8
extent of reader's sympathy towards: 13.127–130, 13.135ff.
extreme grief: 13.93ff., 13.159–60
fails to appease gods before marriage: 13.85–6
fantasises: 13.113–20, 13.135ff., 13.149ff.
father of: 13.25–6, 13.35
high style used by: 13.101–3
home: 13.1–2, 13.35
inconsistent: 3.47–8, 13.73–4, 13.113–20
makes love with revenant husband: 13.105–8

misjudges/misrepresents
Aulis: 13.121ff., 13.127 130
Hector: 13.63–6
husband: 13.5, 13.7ff., 13.65, 13.67–70, 13.79–82, 13.85–6, 13.93ff., 13.158
husband's return from dead: 13.27, 13.49–50, 13.105–8, 13.109–12, 13.113–20, 13.149ff. (*see also* Protesilaus, dead as Laodamia writes)
Paris: 13.43 4, 13.55–62, 13.56, 13.57 8, 13.59, 13.61–2
Troy: 13.53–4
morbid attachment to statue: 13.105–8, 13.149ff.
mother of: 13.25–6
necrophilia: 13.105–8
recent bride: 13.135ff.
regrets missed opportunities: 13.27
sexual language: 13.113 20, 13.135ff., 13.149ff.
suicide: 13.23–4, 13.28, 13.34, 13.41, 13.45 6, 13.70, 13.105–8, 13.109–12n., 13.113–20, 13.149ff.
superstition and knowledge of omens: 13.17–22, 13.49–50, 13.61–2, 13.71–2, 13.83 4, 13.85–6, 13.91–2, 13.109–12, 13.127–30, 13.161–2
letter f: 11.21 2
literal and figurative: 11.48, 14.89
Lucian: 13.43–4n.
Luna
beauty of: 11.47
identified with Diana: 11.47
Lynceus
amorous: 14.69–70
ancestry: 14.73
buried with Hypermestra: 14.127–8
flees: 14.78
kills Danaids/Danaus: 14.15, 14.117, 14.125–6
pseudonym: 14.123
role in trials of Hypermestra and Danaids: 14.125–6
sole groom to be spared: 14.1, 14.73, 14.80–1
Lynceus, lost play by Theodectes: 14.78, 14.125–6

Macareus
attitude towards incest: 11.61
full brother of Canace: 11.89
persuades Aeolus to sanction marriages: 11.63–4, 11.67, 11.101
suicide: 11.62, 11.123
violent seducer: 11.27, 11.39, 11.59–64
'marriage lottery': 11.101, 11.07–8
meditative subjunctive, third person: 13.37–40
metaphors and imagery: 11.55
accounting: 14.80–1, 14.82
artistic: 11.7
elegiac: 13.79–82
funereal: 11.121, 13.23–4, 14.21–2, 14.31–2
military: 11.41, 11.45–6, 11.50, 13.79–82, 14.122
metre
dactylic: 11.65–6, 11.93, 13.51–2, 13.63–6, 13.83–4, 13.133, 14.21, 14.27–8, 14.67–70, 14.105–6
dactylic words: 13.146
elegiac couplet, use of: 13.12–4, 13.17–22, 14.21, 14.52, 14.61 114, 14.65–6
elision: 11.15–6, 11.61, 13.13, 13.23, 13.55, 13.69, 13.87, 14.55, 14.104
enjambement: 11.69ff., 14.110, 14.111 2, 14.131–2
fifth foot spondee: 11.93
first words of line: 14.125–6
hiatus: 11.15–6, 13.87
last word of line: 11.15–6, 13.108, 14.4, 14.14, 14.61 114, 14.86
position of parenthesis: 11.97–8, 13.1–2, 14.47
positions of repeated words: 14.51 2
prosody: 11.64, 11.101, 13.29, 13.67, 13.73–4, 13.133, 14.36, 14.72, 14.73, 14.103, 14.113
sense pauses: 11.34, 11.81–94, 13.83–4, 13.133, 14.21, 14.27–8, 14.41–50, 14.53–4, 14.67 70, 14.105–6, 14.110, 14.125–6
spondaic: 11.25, 14.107
word scanning as amphibrach: 14.47
'middle'/reflexive verbs: 11.93, 14.51
motifs
aged as reliable storytellers: 14.109
assertion of candour: 14.45, 14.47
assiduous companion: 13.161–2
avoidance of *miasma*: 11.97–8
character compared with associated object: 11.11
clothing indicates resources: 13.57–8

criminals fear daylight: 14.71
death and burial in foreign land: 14.129–30
death and marriage/funerals and weddings: 11.101, 14.27–8, 14.31–2 (*see also* failed wedding)
death as night: 14.73–8
death as sleep: 14.73–8
'death for the rapist or marriage to him': 11.39
denial of funeral rites: 14.126
departure scene: 13.7ff., 13.85–6
dolor produces *gemitus*: 11.32
dowdiness of soldiers' wives: 13.37–40
dragged by the hair: 14.83
drink own tears: 11.56
durus pater: 11.8
elegiac: 11.29–34
  appeal to *pia cura*: 14.123–4
  faithful tears: 14.127–8
  'foul adultery': 13.121ff.
  imagine own epitaph: 14.127–8
  imagine own funeral: 14.125–6
  insomnia: 11.31
  lost appetite: 11.30
  love a *malum*: 11.35
  love diagnosed by observer: 11.36
  lover and beloved buried together: 11.125–6
  lover and beloved two lives in one: 11.62, 13.70, 13.77–8
  lover hates separation from beloved: 13.1–2
  lover seeks safety in bosom of beloved: 13.76
  militia amoris: 11.50, 13.79–82
  night endless for lonely lover: 11.31
  night belongs to the lover: 14.73–8
  night spent with beloved passes too quickly: 11.31
  pallor: 11.29
  servitium amoris: 14.59–60
  tearing of clothes and hair, mark of hotheaded lover: 11.59–64
  thinness: 11.29
  trembling heart: 11.28
  wind assists course of departing lover: 13.3
erotic dream: 13.105–8
failed wedding: 11.101, 11.103–6, 14.27–8 (*see also* death and marriage/funerals and weddings)
family curse: 14.85–108
fear makes one suspect the worst: 13.147–8
female susceptibility to material goods: 13.61–2
grasping while asleep: 14.69–70
Greek girls hate Troy: 13.53–4
imprisoned female: 14.3
innocence of child put to death: 11.109–10
lock of hair dedicated to the dead: 11.117–20
metamorphosis
  amazed at reflection of metamorphosed self: 14.93
  number and type of feet: 14.94
  terrified by metamorphosed self: 14.92
militia of childbirth: 11.50
mother and child buried together: 11.125–6
mother and child two lives in one: 11.62
mother unable to perform funeral rites for child: 11.117–20
oaths by *numina*: 13.159–60n.
pain returns after a faint: 13.29
pallor of dead: 13.105–8, 14.37–8
reluctance to narrate past sorrows: 14.21
same day first and last: 11.116
ship gradually departs/approaches: 13.17–22
silence of dead: 13.108
size of funeral urn: 11.125–6
soldier dedicates arms on safe return: 13.49–50
speaking without words: 11.38
speech of vacillating resolve: 14.52
'sprinkle water': 13.25–6
story interspersed with kisses: 13.113–20, 13.119
tears substitute for water or wine: 11.127, 13.109–12, 14.127–8
throat-slitting: 14.5
'to the winds': 13.89–90
traveller unable to escape self: 14.103
virtuous crime: 14.4, 14.71, 14.119–20
warrior a cause of mourning: 13.47–8
warrior armed by female relative: 13.135ff.

winged winds: 11.16
wedding motifs, negation of: 11.103–6
wedding torch and funeral torch: 11.103–6
'welcome home' scene: 13.113–20, 13.118
woman conceals abortion from father of child: 11.43
word spoken is past recalling: 11.55
wrongdoing an evil for the wrongdoer: 14.63–4
ms. abbreviations: 11.21, 11.93, 11.129–30, 14.27
ms. P, attitude of editors towards: 11.61, 11.69, 13.1–2, 13.2, 13.35, 13.73–4, 13.108, 13.135, 14.4, 14.22
multiple intertexts: 13.31–2, 13.85–6, 13.109–12, 13.135ff.

Nero, acted out rôle of Canace giving birth: 11.47ff.
number of ships at Troy: 13.95

omens
blue flame indicates ghosts: 13.109–12n.
call back one departing, unlucky: 13.83–4
cry of *noctua*, lucky or unlucky: 13.109–12
flickering flame, unlucky/announces arrival: 13.109–12
look back when departing, unlucky: 13.17–22
mention of disaster causes it to occur: 13.49–50, 13.61–2
oracles: 13.71–2, 13.91–2, 13.93ff.
speaking cow: 14.87
stumble/tread on threshold, unlucky: 13.85–6
tread on threshold, lucky: 13.88
warding-off of ill omen/ratifying of good omen: 13.49–50, 13.88, 13.109–12, 13.127–130
ordinal numbers: 11.48, 14.121
orthography: 11.69, 13.1–2, 14.1
Ovid
composer of epithalamium: 11.103–6
reshapes own material: 11.44, 11.77–8, 11.87, 13.13, 13.17–22, 13.52, 13.147–8, 14.1, 14.39–40, 14.85–108, 14.86, 14.91, 14.92, 14.93, 14.99
oxymoron: 13.6, 14.120

papyrus, as writing material: 11.4–6
paradox 11.34, 11.116, 13.27, 14.4, 14.5–6, 14.7, 14.52, 14.55, 14.59–60, 14.63–4, 14.71, 14.80–1, 14.87, 14.116, 14.120
parataxis: 13.69, 13.90
parentheses: 11.21, 11.87, 11.90, 11.97–8, 11.129–30, 13.1–2, 13.60, 14.1, 14.31–2, 14.47, 14.109–10, 14.121
pathetic fallacy: 11.45–6, 11.87
patronymics: 11.1–2, 11.7, 13.1–2, 13.35, 13.61, 14.73, 14.105
Pelasgus: 14.23–4
pentameters with interchangeable halves: 11.116, 13.102, 13.163–4, 14.106
perfect tense: 11.116, 14.46, 14.72
personification: 11.4, 11.16, 11.54, 11.57, 13.5, 13.13, 14.5, 14.13, 14.18, 14.19–20, 14.44, 14.45–6, 14.49–50, 14.50, 14.56, 14.76, 14.107, 14.131–2
Phyllis [place]: 13.35
Phyllos: 13.35
Planudes, (lack of) skill as translator: 11.29, 11.52, 11.64, 11.96, 11.113, 13.25–6, 13.65, 14.10, 14.14
pluperfect tense: 11.12, 11.81–94, 13.8, 14.72
predicate, case of: 14.4
present indicative for imperative: 14.77–8
present indicative for future indicative: 14.77–8
present tense, 'vivid': 11.53–6, 11.67, 13.13, 13.60, 14.21, 14.37–8, 14.67–70, 14.75–6, 14.77–8, 14.85–108
'projection': 11.95, 13.105–8, 13.135ff., 13.135, 14.27–8, 14.85–108
proper names, corruption in mss.: 13.25–6, 13.35, 14.123
proper names in plural: 13.68
Protesilaodamia, lost work by Laevius: 13.31–2, 13.135ff., 13.149ff.
Protesilaus
dead when Laodamia writes: 13.3, 13.27, 13.49–50, 13.97, 13.105–8, 13.109–12, 13.113–20, 13.149ff.

escorted by Hermes: 13.105–8
father of: 13.25–6
first to land/first to die: 13.71 2, 13.77–8, 13.91–2, 13.93ff., 13.95, 13.97
great warrior: 13.79–82
home: 13.1–2, 13.35
keen to depart for war: 13.7ff., 13.8, 13.17–22
killer of: 13.43 4, 13.63–6, 13.65, 13.67–70, 13.79–82
makes love as revenant with wife: 13.105–8
oracle predicts death: 13.71 2, 13.91–2
returns to the living: 13.23–4, 13.27, 13.49–50, 13.105–8, 13.109–12, 13.113 20, 149ff.
significance of name: 13.91–2
statue of: 13.33–4, 13.36, 13.105–8, 13.109 12, 13.149ff., 13.159–60
stumbles on departure: 13.85 6
suitor of Helen: 13.45–6
Protesilaus, lost play by Euripides: 13.25–6, 13.31 2, 13.33 4, 13.36, 13.105–8, 13.109–12, 13.135ff., 13.149ff.

readership knowledge and dramatic irony: 11.9–10, 11.27, 11.62, 11.63 4, 11.67, 11.101, 11.109–10, 11.113, 11.116, 11.123, 11.125 6, 11.127, 13.1–2, 13.3, 13.7ff., 13.8, 13.14, 13.17 22, 13.23–4, 13.27, 13.28, 13.41, 13.43 4, 13.45–6, 13.49–50, 13.52, 13.53–4, 13.55–62, 13.56, 13.57–8, 13.59, 13.61–2, 13.63 6, 13.65, 13.67–70, 13.70, 13.71–2, 13.77–8, 13.79–82, 13.88, 13.91–2, 13.93ff., 13.95, 13.97, 13.105–8, 13.109–12, 13.113–20, 13.127 130, 13.147–8, 13.149ff., 13.158, 13.161–2, 14.1–2, 14.4, 14.15, 14.23–4, 14.25–8, 14.31–2, 14.33–4, 14.33, 14.42, 14.55, 14.61 114, 14.73–8, 14.75, 14.78, 14.111–2, 14.111–2, 14.117, 14.120, 14.123–4, 14.125–6, 14.126, 14.127–8, 14.129–30, 14.131–2
reflexive pronoun refers to subject of main clause: 13.73–4
relative clauses
ambiguous antecedent: 14.19 20
antecedent incorporated: 14.11
case of relative pronoun: 13.41
connective: 13.135
emphatic word incorporated: 11.88
mood of verb: 13.91–2, 14.14, 14.36
repetition
'clumsy': 11.21, 11.64, 11.101, 13.63–6, 13.73–4, 13.79 82, 14.47
'colourless': 13.37–40, 13.79–82, 13.159–60
'pointed': 11.97–8, 11.103–6, 11.109 10, 11.129–30, 13.8, 13.10–11, 13.63–6, 13.73–4, 13.87, 13.101–3, 13.104, 13.139–40, 13.149ff., 14.27–8, 14.47, 14.51–2, 14.61 114, 14.65–6, 14.71, 14.77–8, 14.93, 14.100, 14.101–2, 14.103, 14.112
resumption of verb by cognate noun: 11.101
rhymes and jingles: 11.3 4, 11.5, 11.18, 11.67, 11.109–10, 13.73, 13.91–2, 14.4, 14.27, 14.65–6, 14.67, 14.73, 14.91, 14.97, 14.129 30

Schliemann, Heinrich: 13.121ff.n.
self-reflexive markers, signals of allusion, and 'Alexandrian footnotes':
dicor: 13.23 4
exiguus: 14.52
fama est: 13.3, 13.57–8
haec mea dicta: 14.73–8
ille: 13.14, 14.95
ipse: 14.23 4
iste: 14.73–8
jingles: 11.3–4
juxtaposition: 11.117 20
multus: 13.63–6
name of intertext: 11.1–2, 13.135ff.
nescioquis: 13.63–6
number of noun: 14.125–6
'an old story': 14.109 10
parenthesis: 14.47
permanere: 14.85
quisquis: 13.63 6
repetition: 11.109 10, 11.117 20, 14.47
scilicet: 14.85
solutus: 13.12–4
tener: 14.87
tense of verbs: 13.85–6n.
word-order and line correspondance: 11.1–2, 11.44, 11.87, 13.76, 14.9–11, 14.73–8, 14.92

Shakespeare, William: 13.68
Shepherds, lost play by Sophocles: 13.63–6
simile, narratology of: 11.69ff., 11.77–8, 14.41, 14.41–50
similes:
  bacchant-: 13.33–4, 13.35
  flame-: 13.109–12
  snow-: 13.52, 14.39–40
  wind-: 11.77–8, 14.39–40
Simois: 13.53–4
sons of Aegyptus
  decapitated after death: 14.5, 14.80–1
  denied burial: 14.126
  murdered in wives' embraces: 14.69–70
  scene of murder: 14.34
  unsympathetic portrayal: 14.29–30, 14.31–2
suspected lines: 11.1–2, 11.93, 11.107–8, 11.127, 11.129–30, 13.1–2, 13.37–40, 13.60, 13.63–6, 13.73–4, 13.79–82, 13.97–8, 13.139–40, 13.159–60, 13.163–4, 14.1–2, 14.61–114, 14.85–108, 14.101–7, 14.106, 14.109–10, 14.113, 14.131–2
syllepsis: 11.54
symmetry: 11.101, 11.103–6, 11.105, 13.55, 13.61–2, 13.61, 14.59–60, 14.63–4, 14.68, 14.86, 14.131–2
sympathetic magic: 13.149ff.
syncopation: *see* contracted verbs

Tenedos: 13.53–4
tricolon: 11.29–34, 13.8, 14.75–6, 14.93

Troy
  foundation 13.121ff., 13.127–130
  windy: 13.121ff.
'twice-dyed' (δίβαφος) fabrics: 13.37–40

wax, elegiac material: 13.149ff.
whispering: 13.69, 14.51–2, 14.52, 14.53–4
word order
  chiastic: 13.101–3, 13.127–30, 14.5–6, 14.19–20, 14.76, 14.89
  enclosing: 11.69, 11.95, 13.76
  hyperbaton: 11.87, 11.88, 11.124, 11.129, 13.3, 13.79–82, 13.105–8, 13.108, 13.147–8, 14.69–70, 14.108
  inserted apposition: 11.21
  juxtaposition: 11.1–2, 11.93, 11.117–20, 13.1–2, 13.6, 13.23–4, 13.30, 13.91–2, 13.147–8, 14.4, 14.23–4, 14.27–8, 14.44, 14.75–6, 14.87
  postponed enclitics: 11.93
  postponed conjunctions: 11.18, 11.108, 14.98
  tmesis: 13.76
word play: 11.17, 11.21, 11.22, 11.100, 11.121, 13.1–2, 13.37–40, 13.43–4, 13.57–8, 13.61–2, 13.63–6, 13.73–4, 13.75, 13.79–82, 13.89–90, 13.119, 13.140, 13.159–60, 13.161–2, 14.5, 14.17, 14.37–8, 14.65, 14.82, 14.87, 14.100, 14.112, 14.117
Wordsworth, William: 13.109–12

zeugma: *see syllepsis*

3. PASSAGES REFERRED TO IN OVID

Am.
1.1.28: 13.63–6
1.2.1–4: 11.31
1.2.3–4: 11.31
1.2.26: 11.48
1.3.16: 13.65
1.3.21: 14.90, 14.92
1.4.12: 11.78
1.4.15: 14.31–2
1.4.31: 13.67
1.4.61–2: 11.121
1.4.64: 14.42
1.5.14: 11.108
1.6.3–4: 13.69n.
1.6.9: 13.109–12
1.6.31: 14.120
1.6.34: 11.58
1.6.38: 14.29–30
1.6.51: 13.89–90
1.7: 14.5
1.7.21–2: 11.38
1.7.29–30: 11.112, 14.59–60
1.7.43: 11.93n.
1.7.53–6: 11.77–8, 14.39–40, 14.39
1.7.54ff.: 13.52
1.7.56: 11.78
1.7.57–8: 13.52, 14.39–40
1.7.64: 1.94
1.7.67–8: 14.131–2
1.8.19: 14.17
1.8.21–2: 14.52
1.8.59: 13.57–8
1.8.83: 11.30
1.8.107–8: 11.79
1.8.110–1: 11.82
1.9: 11.50, 13.79–82
1.9.35–6: 13.135ff.
1.10: 13.61–2
1.10.30: 13.102
1.10.63–4: 14.131–2
1.11.7: 11.4–6
1.11.15: 11.4–6
1.11.24: 11.4–6
1.12.1: 11.4–6
1.12.3–4: 13.85
1.12.7: 11.4–6
1.13: 11.31
1.13.41: 11.12
1.14.14: 11.64
1.14.55–6: 14.131–2
1.15.9–10: 13.53–4
1.15.17–8: 11.8
2.1.33: 11.11
2.1.45–6: 11.50
2.2.3–4: 14.11
2.2.4: 14.2, 14.52
2.2.5: 14.1
2.2.53: 11.28
2.3.17–8: 14.131–2
2.4.26: 13.118
2.4.47: 11.93n.
2.5.5: 11.4–6
2.5.25: 11.89
2.5.34: 11.52
2.5.46: 11.94
2.6.3: 11.93
2.6.41–2: 13.79–82
2.8.20: 11.78
2.9.39–41: 11.31
2.9.49: 11.11
2.10.28: 13.79–82
2.10.35–6: 13.113–20
2.11: 11.1–2n., 13.1–2, 13.113–20
2.11.10: 11.78
2.11.35: 14.80–1
2.11.43–54: 13.113–20
2.11.45–6: 13.118
2.12.10: 13.60
2.12.26: 13.13
2.13: 11.41
2.13.1: 11.41
2.13.3: 11.43
2.13.6: 13.147–8
2.13.10: 14.107
2.13.15: 11.62
2.13.18: 14.118
2.14: 11.41
2.14.3: 11.41
2.14.7: 13.37–40
2.14.15–6: 14.122
2.14.17: 11.41
2.14.24: 11.41
2.14.27: 11.41, 11.42, 11.92
2.15.15: 11.4–6
2.16.45–6: 13.90
2.16.47: 13.65, 14.123–4

2.18.38: 13.161–2
2.19.7: 14.65–6
2.19.41: 11.4–6
2.19.43: 13.27
3.1.19: 13.91–2
3.1.61: 11.81–94
3.2.5: 13.149ff.
3.2.8: 13.65
3.2.16: 13.149ff.
3.2.28: 13.149ff.
3.4.3: 14.50
3.4.36: 14.50
3.4.41: 14.50, 14.65–6
3.5.8: 11.108
3.5.30: 13.27
3.6.48: 11.94
3.6.72: 11.96
3.6.76: 13.121ff.
3.6.77: 13.91–2
3.8.16: 11.34
3.9.40
3.9.51–2: 14.51
3.13.33–4: 14.103
3.14.31: 11.4–6
3.14.32: 14.31–2

Ars

1.3: 11.48
1.73: 14.61
1.99: 13.149ff.
1.133–4: 14.85
1.147: 14.29–30
1.201: 13.73–4
1.268: 14.27
1.285: 11.23–6
1.383: 11.4–6
1.393: 13.15
1.437: 11.4–6
1.454: 14.42
1.490: 13.41
1.512: 13.65
1.553: 14.39–40
1.555: 13.65
1.563: 14.27
1.573: 13.149ff.
1.578: 13.149
1.623: 14.50
1.624: 13.65
1.657: 13.69
1.633–4: 13.90
1.663: 13.113–20
1.664: 13.118
1.667–8: 13.118
1.677–8: 11.39
1.683ff.: 11.81–94
1.729: 11.29
1.733: 11.29
1.737–8: 11.36
2.3: 11.101
2.24: 13.163–4, 14.106
2.261: 11.101
2.297–8: 13.101–3
2.350: 13.65
2.353–6: 13.149ff.
2.384: 13.63–6
2.395: 11.4–6
2.400: 14.50
2.503: 13.149ff.
2.536: 14.27
2.543: 11.4–6
2.576: 14.42
2.598: 14.9
2.627: 13.37–40
2.660: 14.45–6
2.692: 13.113–20
2.712: 14.31–2
2.713–6: 13.113–20
2.716: 13.13
2.723–4: 13.149ff.
3.2: 14.118
3.5: 13.79–82
3.17: 13.161–2
3.46: 14.27
3.52: 13.149
3.103: 13.60
3.107ff.: 13.37–40
3.128: 13.113–20
3.137ff.: 13.31–2
3.172: 13.57–8
3.174: 11.78
3.185–7: 14.41
3.235: 13.31–2
3.253–4: 13.47–8
3.336: 11.89
3.359: 13.69
3.464: 14.105
3.469: 11.4–6
3.485: 11.4–6
3.496: 11.4–6
3.515: 13.149ff.
3.569: 11.59–64
3.619: 13.37–40
3.621: 11.4–6
3.630: 11.4–6
3.632: 11.51
3.672: 13.135
3.675: 13.149ff.
3.707: 13.27
3.713: 11.89

3.718 20: 13.147 8
3.730: 13.87
3.774: 13.149ff.
3.779: 14.31–2
3.783: 13.35

Fast.
1.33: 11.45–6
1.65: 13.69
1.183: 11.81–94
1.227: 11.81–94
1.265: 11.81–94
1.335: 13.13
1.449: 11.93
1.537: 14.110
1.547: 13.109
1.561: 13.133
1.578: 11.93
1.624: 11.44
1.639: 11.109–10
1.643–4: 14.27
1.706: 13.61
2.29: 11.93n.
2.45: 11.45–6
2.139: 14.50
2.155: 13.13
2.405: 11.87
2.730: 13.65
2.767–8: 11.81–94
2.795: 14.31–2
3.25: 13.113–20
3.112: 11.108
3.149: 11.93n.
3.221–2: 11.87
3.223: 11.93
3.235: 11.93
3.507: 14.36
3.560: 11.89
3.683: 11.23
3.707: 14.2
3.787: 13.69
4.53: 11.89
4.260: 14.50
4.307: 14.50
4.310: 13.120
4.324: 14.50
4.458: 13.35
4.498: 14.103
4.555: 13.109
4.610: 13.120
4.615: 11.93
4.688: 11.81–94
4.791–2: 14.9
4.795: 14.36
4.838: 13.65
4.845–6: 11.56
4.873: 13.61
4.896: 11.93
4.897: 11.81–94
5.103: 11.101
5.242: 14.50
5.475: 13.13
5.479: 11.129–30
5.538: 11.94
5.573: 13.69
5.620: 14.86
5.651: 14.34
5.690: 13.69
6.17: 11.89
6.47: 14.34
6.137: 11.92
6.217: 11.101
6.395–6: 14.11
6.678: 14.29–30

Her.
1.3: 13.53 4
1.5: 11.93
1.5–6: 13.59
1.11 2: 13.147–8
1.12: 11.63
1.21: 11.93n.
1.23: 14.50
1.33–4: 13.68
1.38: 11.34
1.62: 11.4–6
1.63–5: 14.1
1.71 2: 13.147–8
1.85: 14.4
2.6: 11.15–16, 13.61
2.21: 11.93n.
2.35–6: 13.159–60
2.43–4: 13.77–8
2.75: 11.25
2.77: 11.25
2.94: 13.7ff.
2.96: 13.3
2.99: 11.25
2.146: 14.41
2.147–8: 11.129–30, 14.127–8, 14.129–30, 14.131–2
3.3: 11.3–4, 11.4–6
3.4: 11.63
3.6: 14.67
3.11 2: 13.135ff.
3.42: 13.4
3.82: 14.18
3.89: 11.25
3.105–6: 14.2
3.115: 11.25

3.122: 13.69
3.133: 11.11
3.153–4: 13.163–4
4.1–2: 11.1–2
4.7–8: 14.45–6
4.21: 14.87
4.33: 14.123–4
4.58: 11.51
4.84: 11.93n.
4.111: 13.55
4.175: 13.13
4.175–6: 11.129–30
5.7–8: 11.63
5.8: 11.96
5.22: 14.14
5.25–6: 13.63–6
5.30: 14.14
5.43: 11.25
5.45: 11.25, 11.79
5.47–8: 14.41
5.50: 13.3
5.51: 13.7ff.
5.52: 13.14
5.54: 14.14
5.63ff.: 13.17–22
5.68: 11.28, 11.94
5.71: 11.93
5.72: 11.94
5.78: 13.30
5.82: 13.77–8
5.85: 14.55
5.89: 11.93n.
5.101: 14.17
5.113: 11.89
5.123: 11.45–6
5.129: 14.55
5.133: 14.50
6: 13.25–6
6.0b: 13.60
6.31: 13.27
6.41–2: 11.103–6
6.42: 14.31–2
6.45–6: 11.103–6
6.54: 11.50
6.77–8: 13.37–40
6.82: 11.50
6.91: 13.109–12
6.105: 11.97–8
6.119–20: 11.67
6.129–130: 11.124
6.131: 11.25
6.133: 13.121ff.
6.133–4: 14.55
6.137: 14.4
6.137–8: 11.101
6.140: 13.27
6.159: 11.89
7.5–6: 14.131–2
7.41: 14.21
7.49: 11.25, 14.107
7.66: 11.89
7.75: 13.65
7.106: 11.108
7.137: 11.45–6
7.139–40: 11.62
7.177–8: 13.120
7.196: 14.127–8
7.197–8: 11.129–30, 14.127–8, 14.129–30, 14.131–2
8.5: 13.41
8.15: 13.65, 14.123–4
8.22: 13.73–4
8.55: 14.120
8.73: 13.45–6, 13.61
8.75ff.: 14.21
8.97: 11.97–8
8.104: 13.4
8.106: 11.129–30
8.110: 13.4
8.111–4: 14.69–70
8.117ff.: 13.163–4
9.7: 11.89
9.9: 11.25
9.36: 14.122
9.45–6: 14.85
9.49: 14.17
9.75–6: 13.13
9.109: 11.25
9.136: 11.6
9.155: 11.89
9.165: 11.89
9.168: 13.159–60
10: 14.4
10.9–14: 14.69–70
10.11–2: 14.21
10.13: 13.109, 14.43–4
10.29: 13.5
10.29–30: 13.3
10.31–2: 13.23–4
10.37ff.: 11.93–4
10.39: 11.25
10.43: 11.93
10.46: 13.14, 14.14
10.55–6: 14.31–2
10.74: 13.149
10.79–80: 13.147–8
10.83: 11.25
10.96: 11.113

10.95: 13.109–12
10.109–10: 11.88
10.112: 13.73–8
10.113: 13.5
10.117: 11.25
10.135: 13.41
10.149–50: 13.163–4
12.3–4: 11.1–2
12.5: 11.93
12.9: 11.25
12.11: 11.25
12.35: 13.87
12.64: 14.79
12.64ff.: 13.12–4
12.91: 13.60
12.107: 11.93
12.115: 11.89
12.116–7: 14.19–20
12.135–6: 14.47
12.139–40: 14.25 8
12.145: 14.27
12.165: 14.46
12.183: 13.149
15.40: 13.163–4
15.44: 13.118
15.50: 13.113–20
15.95: 13.76
15.98: 11.3–4, 11.4–6
15.100: 13.61
15.102: 11.93n.
15.107–8: 13.159–60n.
15.113–4: 11.93
15.123: 13.65
15.123–34: 13.105–8
15.127: 13.104
15.129–30: 13.118
15.130: 13.119
15.207: 13.133n.
16.1: 13.61
16.21: 13.45–6
16.30: 13.45–6, 13.61
16.50: 13.158
16.53 4: 14.29 30
16.96: 13.65
16.100: 13.61
16.107–10: 13.59
16.135: 13.87
16.145–8: 13.127–30
16.237: 13.27
16.251: 11.96
16.262: 13.13
16.263–4: 13.69
16.263–70: 13.55–62
16.274: 14.99
16.276: 13.45–6
16.286: 13.30
16.287: 11.45–6
16.295: 14.50
16.316: 13.13
16.321: 11.93, 13.159–60n.
16.323: 11.91
16.343: 14.1
16.353–4: 13.55 62, 13.56
16.367–8: 13.63–6
16.369–70: 13.43–4
17.8: 13.45–6, 13.61
17.67ff.: 13.61–2
17.77: 13.149ff.
17.105: 11.93
17.143: 11.50
17.143–4: 14.127–8
17.153: 13.55
17.162: 13.65
17.182: 13.45–6
17.186: 11.108
17.215: 14.127–8
17.221: 11.55
17.236: 11.63–4
17.256: 13.79–82
18.1–2: 13.1–2, 13.61
18.36: 13.13
18.46: 11.19 20
18.58: 14.69
18.69: 11.47
18.74: 11.47
18.82: 14.91
18.96: 14.69
18.113–4: 13.118
18.172: 14.14
18.174: 14.14
18.210: 11.93
19.1–2: 13.1–2
19.25: 14.647
19.26: 11.52
19.48: 14.69
19.59–64: 13.105–8
19.72: 14.39
19.115: 13.159 60
19.128: 13.27
19.151–6: 13.109–12
19.154: 11.34
19.182: 13.69
20.9: 11.51
20.13–4: 13.1–2
20.36: 14.47
20.50: 11.79
20.67: 11.93n.
20.76: 11.108

20.78: 14.67
20.100: 11.100
20.109ff.: 14.21
20.134: 11.30, 11.31
20.150: 11.34
20.154: 11.34
20.231: 13.13
20.242: 14.14
20.243–4: 13.163–4
21.27: 13.13
21.55–6: 11.112
21.72–3: 13.10–11
21.74–5: 13.10–11
21.87: 11.81–94
21.100: 14.11
21.105: 13.149ff.
21.113–5: 11.37
21.157ff.: 11.101, 14.27–8
21.239: 13.55
21.249–50: 13.163–4
Ibis
34: 11.78
151–2: 14.10
154: 13.109
155: 11.93n.
158: 11.52
199: 11.16
353: 14.61
540: 11.100
620: 14.103
635: 11.93n.
Med. Fac.
31: 13.60
Met.
1.1–2: 13.83
1.65: 13.15
1.143: 13.63–6
1.205–6: 11.52
1.218–9: 14.21–2
1.220–1: 14.27
1.224: 14.33–4, 14.33
1.264: 11.16
1.300: 11.66
1.325: 13.77–8, 14.1
1.326: 13.77–8, 14.1
1.358–9: 11.89
1.369: 13.61
1.387: 11.121
1.472: 13.61
1.488: 11.129–30
1.526: 13.13
1.551: 14.1
1.584: 14.89
1.588–750: 14.85–108
1.589: 14.99
1.590–1: 11.97–8
1.612: 14.88
1.632: 14.96
1.633–4: 14.100
1.634: 14.93
1.637: 14.67, 14.91
1.638: 14.92
1.639–40: 14.89
1.640–1: 14.89, 14.90, 14.93
1.641: 14.92, 14.93
1.646ff.: 14.91
1.650: 14.103
1.720: 14.2
1.724–8: 14.101–2
1.724ff.: 14.93
1.726: 14.95
1.726–7: 11.100
1.728: 14.107
1.733ff.: 14.107
1.744: 14.94
1.747: 14.86
2.47: 11.81–94, 11.109–10
2.95: 11.93n.
2.103: 11.81–94
2.208–9: 11.47
2.240: 14.34
2.329: 11.90
2.371: 14.67
2.415: 11.50
2.453: 11.48
2.486: 11.32
2.544: 14.50
2.567: 13.27
2.582: 14.36
2.587: 14.36
2.596: 13.133
2.608–9: 11.62
2.665: 13.108
2.779: 11.31
2.803: 11.89
2.805–6: 13.27
3.19: 11.81–94
3.50: 11.81–94
3.168: 11.90
3.200: 14.93
3.202–3: 14.90
3.310: 11.45–6
3.397: 11.29
3.417: 14.93
3.434: 14.93
3.440: 13.76
3.486: 14.93
3.501: 13.14

3.567: 13.133
3.608: 14.33–4, 14.33
3.629: 11.93
3.687: 14.1
3.720: 11.121
4.120: 11.127
4.139–40: 14.51
4.140: 11.127
4.156–7: 13.135
4.166: 11.125–6
4.167: 11.81–94
4.261: 14.100
4.361: 11.93n.
4.369–70: 11.23
4.402–3: 14.25–8
4.418–9: 13.77–8
4.461: 14.105
4.462: 14.61
4.462–3: 14.5
4.519: 11.93
4.579–80: 11.23
4.591: 14.108
4.592: 14.94
4.620: 14.29–30
4.663: 11.19–20
4.712–3: 14.93
4.740: 13.13
4.798: 11.39
5.9: 11.78
5.13: 11.89
5.18–9: 11.92
5.20: 13.55
5.34: 11.93
5.41–2: 14.27
5.56–8: 14.10
5.97–8: 14.2
5.101: 13.69
5.210: 11.93
5.281–2: 11.97–8
5.303: 13.61
5.375: 13.13
5.436: 11.93n.
5.596: 14.69
5.615: 13.55
5.626: 11.89
5.675: 11.93
6.21: 14.36
6.35: 11.82
6.81: 11.69
6.165–6: 13.57–8
6.212: 14.46
6.248: 11.93
6.277: 11.117–20
6.290: 14.50
6.401–2: 14.27
6.414: 14.34
6.428: 14.27–8
6.428–30: 11.103–6
6.438ff.: 11.81–94
6.444: 11.89
6.464: 13.55
6.489: 11.31
6.509: 13.14
6.523: 11.89
6.529: 14.17
6.531: 14.51
6.552: 13.15
6.564: 11.89
6.571: 11.81–94
6.582: 11.89
6.598: 11.89
6.613: 11.89
6.628: 11.30
6.651: 11.92
6.658: 13.27
6.670: 13.63–6
6.685–6: 13.15
6.707: 11.16
7.51: 11.89
7.77: 13.111
7.86: 11.93
7.126: 11.45–6
7.183: 14.100
7.186: 14.33–4
7.234–6: 11.81–94
7.389: 11.66
7.460: 14.103
7.521: 14.2
7.522: 13.60
7.582: 11.89
7.719: 13.147–8
7.732: 13.15
7.857: 11.93
8.11: 11.47
8.199: 14.36
8.242: 11.89
8.258: 11.66
8.329: 14.29–30
8.419: 11.100
8.421: 13.13
8.475: 11.89
8.478: 11.92
8.520: 13.25–6
8.528: 11.93
8.584: 14.4
8.586: 11.93
8.601: 14.125–6
8.690–1: 14.4

8.721–2: 14.109
8.725: 81–94
8.774: 11.129–30
8.778: 11.89
8.879: 14.109–10
9.53: 14.47
9.60: 11.93
9.106: 14.29–30
9.312–3: 11.67
9.317–8: 14.83
9.319: 14.94
9.371: 13.159–60n.
9.382: 11.89
9.413: 11.93
9.456: 11.23–6
9.466–7: 11.61
9.468 96: 13.105 8
9.510: 11.89
9.518: 14.43–4
9.523: 11.4–6
9.530–1: 11.1 2
9.537: 11.32
9.538–9: 11.29–34
9.561: 13.13
9.571: 11.4 6
9.575: 11.4 6
9.576: 11.82
9.587: 11.4–6
9.604: 11.4–6
9.612: 13.27
9.626: 11.93n.
9.646: 11.81–94
9.695: 13.109
9.707: 11.52
9.727–8: 13.149ff.
9.762–3: 14.27–8
9.769: 14.9
10.7: 14.9
10.18: 14.46
10.59: 13.15
10.62: 13.14
10.105: 14.108
10.160: 13.15
10.180: 14.46
10.200: 13.55
10.248: 13.149ff.
10.283–6: 13.149ff.
10.295–7: 11.48
10.378: 14.43–4
10.386–7: 11.93–4
10.387: 11.93
10.389: 13.108
10.389ff.: 11.35
10.408: 11.97–8
10.438: 14.33
10.465: 11.92
10.479: 11.48
10.502: 11.4
10.503: 11.45–6
10.506: 11.64
10.559: 13.113–20
10.664: 11.93
10.6948: 14.1
11.75: 11.93
11.97–9: 11.81–94
11.100 1: 13.27
11.166: 13.37–40
11.192: 14.39
11.257: 11.48
11.345: 13.47 8
11.369–70: 13.101–3
11.411–4: 11.90
11.444: 11.7
11.453: 13.88
11.461: 13.17–22
11.463ff.: 13.17–22
11.474: 11.81–94
11.478–9: 14.41
11.573: 11.7
11.602: 13.108
11.621: 13.109
11.640–1: 14.27
11.657ff.: 13.17 22
11.705–7: 11.125–6
11.708–9: 11.32
11.715ff.: 13.17–22
11.721: 13.63–6
12.8ff.: 13.3
12.24–9: 13.127 130
12.53: 14.27
12.67–8: 13.63–6
12.125: 13.63–6
12.215: 14.9
12.234: 14.43–4
12.240: 11.89
12.271–3: 14.10
12.287–9: 14.10
12.294–5: 11.100
12.369: 11.78
12.392: 13.27
12.453–4: 11.100
12.469: 13.89–90
12.479: 13.35
12.602: 13.65
12.615–6: 11.125–6
13.178: 14.2
13.181ff.: 13.3
13.203: 11.82

13.241: 13.77–8
13.324–7: 13.53–4
13.386: 13.15
13.391: 11.93
13.391–2: 11.100
13.436: 14.5
13.444: 13.27
13.458–9: 11.100
13.482: 11.89
13.490: 11.127
13.491: 11.93
13.495: 14.2
13.508: 14.1
13.523: 11.101
13.539–40: 11.56
13.561: 11.100
13.598: 11.129–30
13.630: 13.6
13.738: 13.31–2
13.803: 11.11
14.62–3: 14.103
14.100: 13.108
14.177: 11.89, 13.55
14.228: 11.48
14.354: 11.95
14.395: 14.25–8
14.412: 14.27
14.464ff.: 14.21
14.476: 14.34
14.652: 11.93n.
14.707: 11.4–6
14.731: 13.69
14.739: 13.108
14.741: 11.90
14.746: 13.135
14.835–6: 13.65
15.21: 11.59–64
15.134: 11.69
15.164: 14.34
15.196–7: 11.47
15.252: 13.13
15.487: 11.90
15.526–7: 11.55
15.565: 14.93
15.715: 14.29–30
15.818–9: 13.73–4
15.871: 11.7
Phaenomena
FLP 4: 14.61–114
Pont.
1.1.23: 14.36
1.1.27: 11.93n.
1.1.67–8: 13.52
1.2.107: 11.93n.
1.2.131: 14.9
1.2.131–2: 11.103–6
1.5.19–20: 13.37–40
1.6.34: 14.69
1.10.44: 13.128
2.1.11: 11.93n.
2.2.100: 11.108
2.3.89: 13.52
2.4.21: 11.93n.
2.7.5–6: 13.147–8
2.7.31: 11.11
2.8.63: 11.93n.
2.10.31: 13.60
2.10.47: 13.41
3.1.109: 13.161–2
3.2.1–2: 13.1–2
3.4.41: 13.60
3.4.78: 11.55
3.6.30: 13.60
3.9.5: 11.55
3.9.47: 11.93n.
4.9.13: 13.113–20
4.10.16: 13.6
4.10.23–4: 13.60
4.10.51: 14.118
4.10.54: 13.69
Rem.
7: 11.28
59: 11.92
74: 13.128
80: 13.98–9
166: 14.34
280: 13.6
286: 13.90
337: 13.69
417: 13.63–6
434: 13.158
509: 13.108
532: 13.9–10
563–4: 11.8
611: 14.46
637: 11.52
678: 13.90
682: 13.69
711: 13.73–4
723–4: 13.149ff.
773: 13.47–8
780: 13.43–4
Trist.
1.1.115: 13.65
1.1.25: 13.55
1.1.49: 11.93n.
1.2.74: 11.21
13.16: 14.1

1.3.61: 11.93n.
1.3.69: 13.13
1.5.81: 11.93n.
1.6.20: 13.161–2
1.7.20: 11.92
1.8.14: 11.121
1.8.23: 11.93n.
1.8.35: 13.90
1.9.13: 14.27
1.9.63: 13.69
1.10.49–50: 13.69
2.53: 13.159–60n.
2.56: 13.41
2.106: 11.21
2.154: 11.108
2.182: 11.108
2.211–2: 13.121ff.
2.308: 14.50
2.323: 11.93n.
2.369: 11.93n.
2.403–4: 13.91–2
2.457: 11.129
2.495: 11.93n., 13.77–8
2.515: 13.121ff.
2.574: 13.65
3.1.61–2: 14.2, 14.52
3.2.19–20: 13.52
3.3.5: 11.89
3.3.65: 11.125–6
3.5.43: 11.93n.
3.7.11–4: 11.90
3.8.28: 11.30
3.10.45: 11.16
3.12.53–4: 13.69
4.2.57: 13.41
4.4.43: 13.69
4.6.47: 14.27
4.8.11–2: 13.76
4.8.24: 11.101
4.9.15: 11.93n.
4.10.112: 13.41
4.10.123–4: 13.27
5.1.20: 11.25
5.1.27–9: 13.60
5.1.29: 13.60
5.1.75: 11.93n.
5.2.34: 13.65
5.3.48: 13.128
5.4.22: 11.93n.
5.5.43: 13.135
5.12.37: 11.93n.
5.14.39: 13.35
[Ovid]
Nux
5: 13.55
167: 11.89
[Ovid]
Ep. Drus.
101–2: 13.52
161–3: 11.125–6
210: 14.18
283: 13.61
315–6: 14.31–2

4. PASSAGES REFERRED TO IN OTHER AUTHORS

Act. Petr.
33: 11.23
Adespota
TrGF 454: 14.117
Aeschylus
Ag.
462–3: 11.105
Danaides
TrGF 43: 14.79–80
TrGF 44: 14.4, 14.15
Eu.
52: 11.105
Prom.
566: 14.103
588: 14.90
636: 14.101
649–50: 14.100
669–71: 14.111–2
674: 14.90
696–741: 14.101–2
729: 14.107
732–4: 14.101
782–822: 14.101–2
823–52: 14.101–2
846: 14.112
846ff.: 14.107
848–52: 14.109–10
859: 14.33
865: 14.1
865–8: 14.4
866–8: 14.5–6
867–8: 14.6, 14.7
877–93: 14.93
Septem
699: 11.105
Supp.
4–9: 14.111–2
49–55: 14.109
162–3: 14.103
163–6: 14.85
251: 14.23–4
293: 14.95
295: 14.95
299: 14.87
306–8: 14.103
311: 14.107
311ff.: 14.101–2
319: 14.73
538ff.: 14.93
539–40: 14.96
544–5: 14.101
571ff.: 14.107, 14.109–10
1010: 14.23–4
Schol. Aeschylus
Prom.
853: 14.61–114, 14.61, 14.80–1
865: 14.4n.
Alcman
24: 13.43–4
Anacreontea
10: 13.149ff.
15: 13.149ff.
16: 13.149ff.
Anth. Graec.
5.2: 13.105–8
5.24.4: 13.113–20
5.128.1: 11.59–64
5.166: 13.149ff.
5.243: 13.105–8
6.248–1: 14.29–30
6.333: 13.109–12
9.166.3: 13.121ff.
12.135: 11.36
12.183: 13.149ff.
16.99.3: 14.29–30
Antiphon
Third Tetralogy
4.5: 14.63–4
pseudo-Apollodorus
Bib.
1.7.4: 11.19–20
2.1: 14.61–114
2.1.3: 14.87, 14.109–10
2.1.4: 14.23–4, 14.61, 14.80–1
2.1.5: 14.3, 14.4, 14.11, 14.15, 14.33
3.13.3: 13.25–6
Epit.
3.30: 13.63–6, 13.105–8n., 13.109–12n., 13.149ff.
Apollonius Rhodius
1.47: 13.35
Schol. Apollonius Rhodius
1.224: 13.25–6
Apuleius
Met.
5.21: 14.52
5.23: 14.69–70

8.7: 13.149ff.
10.13: 14.96
11.25: 11.100
Schol. Aristides
3.671–2D: 13.105–8n., 13.135ff.n.
Aristophanes
Ach.
93: 11.79
Ra.
1080: 11.47ff.
Schol. Aristophanes
Nu.
1371: 11.27
Aristotle
Mete.
364b: 11.78
Artemidorus
Oneirocritica
1.44: 11.92
5.57: 11.92
Augustine
de Doctrina
2.20: 13.88
Epist.
43.27: 11.109–10
155.3: 11.109–10
in Psalm. 36.21
serm. 2.13: 11.109–10
Ausonius
Epigram.
41.5–6: 13.91–2
Epitaph.
12: 13.91–2
Caecilius
109: 14.113
Caesar
Gal.
4.16.5–6: 14.125–6
7.77.8: 11.89
8.41.4: 11.45–6
Callimachus
Aetia
3.75.44–8: 14.73–8
Epigr.
43: 11.36
Hec.
fr. 69: 14.41
Hymn
1.15: 11.66
3.25: 11.66
6.91–2: 13.52
6.98–9: 11.19–20
Calvus
FLP 8: 14.123–4
FLP 9: 14.93, 14.96
FLP 9–14: 14.85–108
FLP 10: 14.93
FLP 12: 14.101–2
FLP 13: 14.101–2
Cassius Dio
62.10.2: 11.47ff.
Cato
fr. 58 Malcovati[2]: 11.89
Catullus
9.6–9: 13.113–20
11: 13.161–2
34.8: 11.66
34.15–6: 11.47
37.17: 14.73
42.3: 13.121ff.
61.9–10: 11.103–6
61.14–5: 11.103–6
61.99: 13.121ff.
61.114: 11.103–6
61.117: 14.103
61.197: 11.103–6
62.5 *etc.*: 11.103–6
62.59–65: 14.65–6
64.45: 14.25–8
64.60: 11.93–4
64.64–5: 14.51
64.131: 11.93–4
64.223: 11.21
64.231–2: 11.100
64.282: 11.78
64.319: 14.36
65.24: 11.52
66.75–6: 11.4
68.70–84: 13.85–6
68.74: 13.2
68.74–5: 13.7ff.
68.79ff.: 13.104
68.81: 13.135ff.n.
68.85–6: 13.71–2
68.103ff.: 13.121ff.
68.125ff.: 13.118
68.131: 14.41
68.149: 13.41
84.8: 14.36
CE
640: 11.116
1338: 11.125–6
Cicero
Arat.
33.13: 11.16
430: 13.47–8
Att.
2.24.1: 13.147–8

9.14.1: 14.1
13.22.3: 14.1
de Orat.
2.66.265: 13.68
Div.
2.84: 13.85–6, 13.88
Fam.
9.19.1: 11.1–2
Mil.
86: 14.119
N.D.
2.69: 11.48
2.111: 11.16n.
3.23: 11.61
Off.
2.28: 11.112
Planc.
90: 14.46
Tusc.
3.20: 13.135
Vat.
13: 11.105
Ver.
5.163: 14.46
5.173: 14.119
CIL
1.2.1211: 14.66
5.1710: 11.116
Cinna
FLP 13: 14.73
Claudian
Cons. Hon.
4.236: 13.13
de Rapt.
3.177: 11.94
Columella
6.37.9: 11.23
Curtius
6.10.31: 14.1
Danais
14.111
Dictys Cretensis
Bel.
1.3: 13.59, 13.60
2.11: 13.95
pseudo-Dio Chrysostom
37.46: 13.149ff.
Dionysius of Halicarnassus
Antiquitates Romanae
1.79.6: 11.87
2.45.5: 11.87
Dioscorides
De Materia Medica
2.1: 11.29
Ennius
Ann. 8
fr. 14 Skutsch: 14.33
Cresphontes
fr. 59 Jocelyn: 11.117–20
Medea
fr. 109 Jocelyn: 11.50
Sat.
fr. 18 Vahlen[3]: 11.89
Euripides
Aeolus
fr. 14 Nauck: 11.11, 11.19–20
fr. 15 Nauck: 11.19–20
fr. 16 Nauck: 11.19–20
fr. 17 Nauck: 11.23–6
fr. 20 Nauck: 11.19–20
fr. 21 Nauck: 11.19–20
fr. 22 Nauck: 11.19–20
fr. 24 Nauck: 11.23–6
Alcestis
348–56: 13.105–8, 13.149ff.
And.
107: 11.79
Archelaus
fr. 2 Austin: 14.4, 14.33
fr. 228 Nauck: 14.61
Ba.
100: 13.33–4
El.
109–12: 13.36
1345: 11.105
Hec.
629–37: 13.59
944: 13.43–4
1016–8: 14.1–2
Hippolytus
176ff.: 11.39
I.A.
74: 13.57–8
378ff.: 13.121ff.
381–4: 13.47–8
1414–5: 13.127–130
Medea
250–1: 11.50
1021ff.: 14.52
1220–1: 11.125–6
Or.
321: 11.105
408: 11.105
Ph.
1603: 11.85–6
Protesilaus
fr. 646a Nauck: 13.105–8n.
fr. 647 Nauck: 13.25–6, 13.105–8n.

fr. 649 Nauck: 13.25–6
fr. 654 Nauck: 13.105–8n.
fr. 655 Nauck: 13.105–8n., 13.149ff.
fr. 656 Nauck: 13.149ff.
Rhesus
886–8: 11.113
896–7: 11.113
Supp.
1054ff.: 13.33–4
Tr.
1ff.: 13.127 130
353.405: 13.135ff.
368–9: 13.121ff.
386ff.: 13.135
991–2: 13.57–8
991ff.: 13.61–2
Uncertain play
fr. 846 Nauck: 14.23–4
Schol. Euripides
Hec.
886: 14.4, 14.33, 14.61 114, 14.61, 14.117
Schol. Euripides
Or.
857: 14.23–4
872: 14.23–4
932: 14.23–4
1248: 14.23–4
Phoen.
106: 14.23–4
Eustathius
ad Il.
1.42: 14.1, 14.23–4, 14.33, 14.61 114, 14.61, 14.69–70
2.700–2: 13.79–82
2.701: 13.25–6, 13.63–6n., 13.105–8n., 13.109–12n., 13.149ff.
ad Od.
11.521: 13.71 2, 13.91–2
Frontinus
Str.
1.12: 13.88
Gellius
16.3.3: 11.29
Herodotus
1.4: 13.47–8
7.113.2: 13.35
9.116: 13.25–6
Hesiod
Aegimius
14.101–2
Catalogue
fr. 9: 11.11
fr. 199: 13.45–6
fr. 199.6: 13.25–6
Inachi Progenies
fr. 124: 14.87, 14.88
Theogony
278–9: 11.39
Homer
Il.
2.147–8: 14.39–40
2.300: 13.1–2
2.700: 13.93ff.
2.701: 13.7ff., 13.63–6, 13.91 2n.
2.702: 13.97
2.705: 13.25–6
3.38 40: 13.43–4
3.39: 13.43–4
3.180: 11.79
3.305: 13.121ff.
3.444: 13.59
4.8: 14.27–8
4.50–2: 14.27–8
5.64: 13.56
5.908: 14.27–8
6.466ff.: 13.135ff.
8.446ff.: 13.127 130
8.499: 13.121ff.
11.452–3: 11.117–20
12.115: 13.121ff.
13.724: 13.121ff.
13.769: 13.43–4
17.226: 11.79
18.155–8: 14.45–6
18.174: 13.121ff.
20.223: 13.15
21.123–4: 11.117–20
21.441ff.: 13.127 130
22.145: 13.121ff.
23.64: 13.121ff.
23.297: 13.121ff.
Od.
7.207ff.: 14.21
9.1ff.: 14.21
10.2: 11.11
11.206–8: 14.45–6
13.80: 14.33–4
19.204ff.: 13.52
Schol. Homer
Iliad
1.42: 14.34
Horace
A.P.
390: 11.55

Carm.
1.1.24: 13.47–8
1.4.19–20: 11.28
1.26.2: 13.89–90
1.36: 13.113–20
2.1.21: 14.35–6
2.6.1: 13.161–2
2.6.23: 11.127
2.8.21–4: 14.55
2.11.8: 11.31
2.12.25ff.: 13.118
2.16.18–20: 14.103
3.3.25–6: 13.57–8
3.4.6: 14.35–6
3.4.47: 14.118
3.7.18: 13.25–6
3.11.25–6: 14.1–2
3.11.26: 14.55
3.11.30: 14.5–6
3.11.30–2: 14.4, 14.47
3.11.31–2: 14.19
3.11.33: 14.1
3.11.33–4: 14.32
3.11.34–5: 14.4
3.11.35: 14.55, 14.120
3.11.37–52: 14.73–8
3.11.39–40: 14.15
3.11.42–8: 14.3
3.11.43: 14.4
3.11.45–8: 14.9–11
3.11.51–2: 14.127–8
3.21.4: 11.31
3.27.58: 11.23–6
4.14.20–1: 14.41
Ep.
1.5.12: 14.65–6
1.18.71: 11.55
S.
1.4.39: 14.4
1.5.68: 11.25
1.7.15: 13.43–4
1.10.16: 14.11
2.8.77–8: 14.53–4
Hyginus
Fab.
81: 13.45–6
103: 13.25–6, 13.63–6, 13.91–2, 13.105–8n.
104: 13.105–8n., 13.109–12n., 13.149ff.
168: 14.61–114, 14.61, 14.80–1, 14.111
242.2: 11.62
273: 14.15
273.1: 14.27
Juvenal
3.90–1: 14.11
14.144: 11.69
Laevius
Protesilaodamia
FLP 15: 13.105–8n.
FLP 17: 13.31–2
FLP 18: 13.135ff., 13.149ff.
Livy
1.4.6: 11.87
2.6.2: 14.1
2.7.8: 14.46
3.67.1: 14.1
21.40.4: 11.50
22.12.1: 11.50
22.44.7: 13.120
24.10.10: 14.87
31.41.11: 14.33
45.6.6: 14.71
Lucan
2.232: 14.109
3.651: 14.69
3.662: 14.69
4.287–8: 11.29
6.563ff.: 11.117–20
9.780–2: 13.52
Lucian
D.Deor.
7 (3): 14.100
D.Mar.
11 (7): 14.88
Dial. Mort.
27: 13.7ff., 13.43–4
28.1: 13.63–6
410.1: 13.135ff.n.
Schol. Lucian
Charon
1: 13.105–8n.
Lucilius
ROL 214: 14.113
ROL 216: 13.47–8
Lucretius
2.633–4: 11.73
3.364: 14.17
3.1068–9: 14.104
4.769: 14.69
5.226–7: 11.87
5.1012: 11.23
Lycophron
Alex.
16–27: 13.59
1292: 14.108
Schol. Lycophron
Alex.
530: 13.63–6

Manilius
2.3: 13.63–6n.
4.606: 14.107
Martial
2.4.7–8: 14.123–4
4.7.1: 14.42
5.16.13: 11.61
11.91: 11.7
12.59.8: 11.4
14.180: 14.88
Martianus Capella
9.896: 14.17
Moschus
Europa
44: 14.105
Nonius
500.14: 13.135
Nonnus
Dionysiaca
3.311: 14.5, 14.8
3.312: 14.4
24.192–5: 13.31–2
P.Oxy. 2457.21:
11.11, 11.27, 11.35,
11.41, 11.47ff., 11.101
P.Oxy 3707:
14.61
Pacuvius
Antiopa
ROL 19: 14.83
Teucer
ROL 353–60: 13.5
Paulus
Fest.
p. 18M: 13.119
Pausanias
2.16.1: 14.1–2, 14.5–6,
14.23–4, 14.61
2.19.6: 14.6–7
2.20.7: 14.4, 14.6–7
2.21.1: 14.6–7
2.24.2: 14.5, 14.15, 14.80–1
2.25.4: 14.78
2.37.1: 14.15
3.12.2: 14.15
7.21.13: 14.23–4
10.10.5: 14.5, 14.8
Petronius
138.7: 13.118
Phaedrus
1.18.5: 11.66
1.19.4: 11.66
Philostratus
Imagines
2.9.5: 13.33–4
Pindar
N.
4.57: 13.25–6
10.6: 14.1, 14.5
6.43: 11.92
9.111ff.: 14.1–2
9.112: 14.15
Schol. Pindar
N.
10a: 14.4
10.6: 14.33
4.92a: 13.25–6
O.
9.68: 11.19–20
P.
9.195: 14.1
9.195a: 14.4
Plato
Axiochus
366d: 11.87
Leg.
8.838c: 11.62
Plautus
Am.
1058: 13.25–6
As.
823: 11.61
Bac.
225–6: 13.149
247: 13.25–6
Cur.
311–3: 13.25–6
Men.
1097: 11.61
Mil.
662: 14.29–30
1331–2: 13.25–6
Poen.
889: 14.35–6
Ps.
575: 11.100
941: 11.100
Rud.
557–8: 13.149
Trin.
833: 11.95
1091–2: 13.25–6
Truc.
366: 13.25–6
Pliny
Nat.
8.183: 14.87
16.219: 11.78
18.20: 11.129–30
33.130: 14.93

Pliny
Ep.
6.10.4: 14.127-8
7.24.7: 14.115
9.19.1: 14.127-8
Plutarch
Caes.
1: 13.68
Moral.
263e: 14.9
760f: 13.135ff.
Quaestiones Romanae
29: 14.31-2
Rom.
15.6: 14.31-2
19.2: 11.87
pseudo-Plutarch
Moralia
312c [= *parallel. Min.* 28a]: 11.27, 11.62, 11.89, 11.97-8
Proclus
Cypriorum Enarratio
13-15: 13.59
Propertius
1.3.20: 14.105
1.8: 11.1-2n., 13.1-2
1.11.18: 13.147-8
1.13.29: 14.99, 14.100
1.17.19ff.: 14.125-6
1.19.3ff.: 14.125-6
1.19.7-10: 13.105-8
1.20.12: 13.135
2.2.6: 14.99
2.6.5: 14.19
2.13.17ff.: 14.125-6
2.13.29: 11.117-20
2.13.35-6: 14.127-8
2.24.35-6: 13.111
2.24.35ff.: 14.125-6
2.24.52: 11.93
2.28.17: 14.90, 14.91
2.28.18: 14.97
2.29.23: 14.79
2.31.3-4: 14.2
2.33: 14.85-108
2.33.4: 14.105
2.33.7-8: 14.101-2
2.33.9: 14.90
2.33.9-10: 14.87, 14.91
2.33.11-2: 14.96
2.34.9: 14.123
3.16.21ff.: 14.125-6
3.20.13-4: 14.73-8
3.20.14: 11.31
3.22.35: 14.95
3.22.35-6: 14.87, 14.88, 14.90
4.3: 11.1-2
4.3.3-6: 11.3-4
4.3.43-6: 13.135ff.
4.3.49-50: 13.30
4.3.51-2: 13.31-2
4.3.57ff.: 13.109-12
4.3.71-2: 13.49-50
4.4.45-6: 13.109-12
4.7.7-8: 13.159-60
4.7.47-8: 13.149ff.
4.7.63: 14.1
4.7.67: 14.1
4.7.67-8: 14.4, 14.5-6
Quintilian
Decl.
280: 11.39
335.3: 13.60
Inst.
4.2.39: 14.69
9.3.29: 14.47
9.4.41: 11.18
10.7.14: 13.119
11.2.46: 13.119
12.10.29: 11.21-2
12.10.31: 14.87
Quintus Smyrnaeus
13.355: 14.33-4
Sallust
Jug.
87.2: 11.50
Sappho
31.5-6: 11.28
Seneca
Con.
2.2.9-11: 14.52
2.2.12: 14.106
2.7.4: 11.82
7.1.27: 14.42
7.3.9: 14.1
8.6: 11.39
Suas.
3: 13.121ff.
3: 13.127-130
Seneca
Ag.
82: 14.60
732: 11.40
Ep.
7.5: 14.63-4
10.3: 13.108

49.1: 11.56
96.1 2: 11.1 2
Her. F.
1088: 14.69
Her. O.
278–9: 11.89
729–30: 13.52
Med.
15: 11.105
67: 11.103–6
110–2: 11.103–6
555–6: 11.108
880: 11.125–6
Nat.
7.14.1: 14.69
Phaed.
20: 11.78
589: 13.27
1195: 14.2
Phoen.
255–6: 11.85–6
Tro.
580: 11.100
799–810: 11.117–20
806–9: 11.117–20
Servius
ad Aen.
1.273: 11.87
2.27: 11.18
4.103: 14.9
4.262: 13.37–40
6.447: 13.105–8n., 13.113–20
7.201: 14.107
10.497: 14.61–114, 14.61,
14.125–6
11.186: 11.105
Silius Italicus
2.279–80: 11.52
2.529: 11.105
2.560: 11.94
8.91ff.: 13.149ff.
13.69: 11.69
13.575: 11.105
Sophocles
Antigone
74: 14.4
775: 11.97–8
891: 14.31–2
923–4: 14.4
O.C.
344: 11.79
O.T.
719: 85–6
Ph.
1126: 11.79
Tr.
775: 11.79
Statius
Ach.
1.77: 11.94
1.672–3: 11.39–40
Silv.
1.2.39–40: 11.28
1.2.255: 11.103–6
1.4.94–5: 13.73–4
2.1.129: 13.37–40
2.7.120ff.: 13.33–4,
13.105–8n.
2.7.129: 13.149ff.
3.2: 13.113–20
3.2.35–41: 13.113–20
3.5.53: 11.93
5.1.179–80: 11.93
5.3.273: 13.35
Theb.
4.133–4: 11.105
4.633–4: 11.105
5.212–7: 14.69–70
6.624–5: 11.94
8.156–7: 11.87
11.75: 11.105
Schol. Statius
Theb.
2.222: 14.80–1
Stobaeus
4.20.72: 11.27, 11.62, 11.89,
11.97–8, 11.125–6
Suetonius
D.A.
65: 13.43–4
Jul.
1: 13.68
59: 13.88
493: 14.42
Nero
21.3: 11.47ff.
Tacitus
Dial.
33.5: 11.39
Hist.
5.13: 14.27–8
Terence
Ad.
623: 11.55
Eu.
313–4: 14.39–40

Ph.
414–5: 11.109–10
Theocritus
7.74–5: 13.52
Theodectes
Lynceus
TrGF 3a: 14.78
Thucydides
1.3.2: 11.19–20
Tibullus
1.1: 11.103–6
1.1.61–2: 14.127–8
1.1.61ff.: 14.125–6
1.3.5–6: 11.117–20
1.3.5ff.: 14.125–6
1.3.9ff.: 13.85–6
1.3.13–4: 13.17–22
1.3.55–6: 14.127–8
1.4.54: 13.119
1.4.55: 13.118
1.5: 13.1–2
2.1.5: 14.51–2
2.1.63: 14.66
2.6.40: 14.60
[Tibullus]
3.2.9ff.: 14.125–6
3.2.11–2: 14.127–8
3.2.29–30: 14.127–8
3.4.96: 11.78
3.9.24: 13.76
3.13.10: 14.123–4
3.17.1: 14.123–4
Tzetzes
Antehom.
248: 13.91–2
Chil.
2.5.759ff.: 13.105–8n.
2.52: 13.149ff.
Schol. ad Lycophronem
245: 13.91–2
Valerius Flaccus
3.415: 11.48
4.357: 14.95
4.379: 14.97
4.380: 14.88
7.294: 11.94
8.150–2: 11.94
Varro
L.
7.42: 14.116
8.63: 14.73
Men.
11.345: 13.47–8
R.
2.7.12: 13.149
Virgil
Ecl.
4.61: 11.48
5.16: 11.69
7.65–6: 11.78
8.41: 13.87
10.48: 14.98
Georg.
2.65–6: 11.78
2.310–11: 13.15
3.21: 11.69
3.483: 11.29
4.198–9: 13.113–20
4.329: 14.57–8
4.377: 11.89
4.385: 13.111
4.475–7: 14.125–6
Aen.
1.56: 11.67
1.56–7: 11.17
1.108: 13.15
1.139–40: 11.18
1.317: 11.16
1.319: 13.13
1.671–2: 14.85
2.3ff.: 14.21
2.9: 11.31
2.57: 14.51
2.77–8: 14.45, 14.47
2.82: 14.73
2.82–3: 14.21
2.133: 11.69
2.198: 13.95
2.242–3: 13.85–6
2.403–4: 14.83
2.496: 14.41
2.265: 14.33
2.625: 13.127–130
2.646: 14.80–1
2.774: 14.72
2.792–3: 14.45–6
3.3: 13.127–130
3.328: 13.61
3.681: 14.72
4.99: 14.57–8
4.103: 14.9
4.166: 14.27–8
4.262: 13.37–40
4.301: 13.33–4
4.309–13: 13.121ff.
4.360: 14.647

4.384: 11.105
4.388: 13.13
4.508: 13.149ff.
4.522: 14.79
4.645: 13.98–9
5.376–7: 14.69
5.412: 11.89
5.774: 11.69
5.858: 11.59–64
6.164: 13.10–11
6.166–7: 13.63–6n.
6.306–8: 14.125–6
6.406–7: 11.97–8
6.447–8: 13.161–2
6.520–2: 14.33–4
6.700–1: 14.45–6
6.808: 11.69
7.117–119: 11.52
7.201: 14.107
7.236–7: 11.71
7.329: 11.105
7.456–7: 11.105
9.481ff.: 11.117–20
10.136: 11.15–16
10.304: 13.96
10.443: 11.9–10
10.486: 13.146
10.496–9: 14.5
10.497: 14.1
10.507–9: 11.116
10.528–9: 13.71–2
10.715: 13.79–82
11.633–5: 14.37–8
12.173: 11.69
12.298–300: 14.10
12.932ff.: 14.125–6
[Virgil]
Ciris
148: 11.69
237ff.: 35
254ff.: 39
280–1: 11.97–8
306: 14.117
385: 14.75

SUPPLEMENTS TO MNEMOSYNE

EDITED BY H. PINKSTER, H.W. PLEKET, C.J. RUIJGH
D.M. SCHENKEVELD, P.H. SCHRIJVERS AND S.R. SLINGS

Recent volumes in the series:

190. Hout, M.P.J. van den. *A Commentary on the Letters of M. Cornelius Fronto.* 1999. ISBN 90 04 10957 9
191. Kraus, C. Shuttleworth (ed.). *The Limits of Historiography.* Genre and Narrative in Ancient Historical Texts. 1999. ISBN 90 04 10670 7
192. Lomas, K. & T. Cornell. *Cities and Urbanisation in Ancient Italy.* ISBN 90 04 10808 4 *In preparation*
193. Tsetskhladze, G.R. (ed). *History of Greek Colonisation and Settlement Overseas.* 2 vols. ISBN 90 04 09843 7 *In preparation*
194. Wood, S.E. *Imperial Women.* A Study in Public Images, 40 B.C.-A.D. 68. 1999. ISBN 90 04 11281 2
195. Ophuijsen, J.M. van & P. Stork. *Linguistics into Interpretation.* Speeches of War in Herodotus VII 5 & 8-18. 1999. ISBN 90 04 11455 6
196. Tsetskhladze, G.R. (ed.). *Ancient Greeks West and East.* 1999. ISBN 90 04 11190 5
197. Pfeijffer, I.L. *Three Aeginetan Odes of Pindar.* A Commentary on *Nemean* V, *Nemean* III, & *Pythian* VIII. 1999. ISBN 90 04 11381 9
198. Horsfall, N. *Virgil,* Aeneid 7. A Commentary. 2000. ISBN 90 04 10842 4
199. Irby-Massie, G.L. *Military Religion in Roman Britain.* 1999. ISBN 90 04 10848 3
200. Grainger, J.D. *The League of the Aitolians.* 1999. ISBN 90 04 10911 0
201. Adrados, F.R. *History of the Graeco-Roman Fable.* I: Introduction and from the Origins to the Hellenistic Age. Translated by L.A. Ray. Revised and Updated by the Author and Gert-Jan van Dijk. 1999. ISBN 90 04 11454 8
202. Grainger, J.D. *Aitolian Prosopographical Studies.* 2000. ISBN 90 04 11350 9
203. Solomon, J. *Ptolemy* Harmonics. Translation and Commentary. 2000. ISBN 90 04 115919
204. Wijsman, H.J.W. *Valerius Flaccus Argonautica, Book VI.* A Commentary. 2000. ISBN 90 04 11718 0
205. Mader, G. *Josephus and the Politics of Historiography.* Apologetic and Impression Management in the *Bellum Judaicum.* 2000. ISBN 90 04 11446 7
206. Nauta, R.R. *Poetry for Patrons.* Literary Communication in the Age of Domitian. 2001. ISBN 90 04 10885 8
207. Adrados, F.R. *History of the Graeco-Roman Fable.* II: The Fable during the Roman Empire and in the Middle Ages. Translated by L.A. Ray. Revised and Updated by the Author and Gert-Jan van Dijk. 2000. ISBN 90 04 11583 8
208. James, A. & K. Lee. *A Commentary on Quintus of Smyrna,* Posthomerica V. 2000. ISBN 90 04 11594 3
209. Derderian, K. *Leaving Words to Remember.* Greek Mourning and the Advent of Literacy. 2001. ISBN 90 04 11750 4
210. Shorrock, R. *The Challenge of Epic.* Allusive Engagement in the *Dionysiaca* of Nonnus.

2001. ISBN 90 04 11795 4

211. Scheidel, W. (ed.). *Debating Roman Demography.* 2001. ISBN 90 04 11525 0
212. Keulen, A.J. *L. Annaeus Seneca* Troades. Introduction, Text and Commentary. 2001. ISBN 90 04 12004 1
213. Morton, J. *The Role of the Physical Environment in Ancient Greek Seafaring.* 2001. ISBN 90 04 11717 2
214. Graham, A.J. *Collected Papers on Greek Colonization.* 2001. ISBN 90 04 11634 6
215. Grossardt, P. *Die Erzählung von Meleagros.* Zur literarischen Entwicklung der kalydonischen Kultlegende 2001. ISBN 90 04 11952 3
216. Zafiropoulos, C.A. *Ethics in Aesop's Fables: The* Augustana *Collection.* 2001. ISBN 90 04 11867 5
217. Rengakos, A. & T.D. Papanghelis (eds.). *A Companion to Apollonius Rhodius.* 2001. ISBN 90 04 11752 0
218. Watson, J. *Speaking Volumes.* Orality and Literacy in the Greek and Roman World. 2001. ISBN 90 04 12049 1
219. MacLeod, L.. *Dolos and Dike in Sophokles' Elektra.* 2001. ISBN 90 04 11898 5
220. McKinley, K.L. *Reading the Ovidian Heroine.* "Metamorphoses" Commentaries 1100-1618. 2001. ISBN 90 04 11796 2
221. Reeson, J. *Ovid* Heroides *11, 13 and 14.* A Commentary. 2001. ISBN 90 04 12140 4